THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

SAMPLE COPY

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Subscribers In 50 States

RETURN ADDRESS
7314 Zimpel Street
New Orleans 18, Louisiana

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
New Orleans, La.
Permit No. 330

FORM 3547 Requested

Vol. VII No. 1 | JANUARY 1961 | New Orleans, La.

Goldwater's Image

Conservative Senator Softens Views, Offers A Plan to Build GOP

(Excerpts from Mr. Nowak's article which appeared in the WALL STREET JOURNAL of 1/11/61)

By ROBERT D. NOVAK
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON—Sen. Barry Goldwater and his allies are carefully constructing a doctrine of "progressive conservatism" as a new platform for the Republican Party—and possibly as a vehicle for a Goldwater drive for the White House in 1964.

A privately-circulated 29-page manifesto composed by the Goldwater wing of the party presents a conservative philosophy intended to appeal to "that dragooned and ignored individual, 'The Forgotten American.'"

The manifesto's pronouncements on inflation, labor, social welfare, higher education, foreign policy and other matters still sound an incomparably more conservative note than the G.O.P. national platform or the recent campaign of Vice President Nixon. What's more, many of the familiar Goldwater battle cries survive: Federal action against union political activity and picket-line violence, opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations, abhorrence of Federal budget deficits.

But read the document carefully, and you find significant shifting on ideological ground. Mr. Goldwater is softening his past condemnation of Social Security, foreign aid and the United Nations. Absent are such longtime slogans of Mr. Goldwater and the Republican right wing as "right to work" laws barring compulsory unionism, application of the anti-trust laws to unions, states' rights, the prerogatives of management and private property.

Gone, too, is past conservative insistence on a passive role for the Federal Government. Instead, the manifesto proposes certain broad Federal activity: "Inasmuch as the Federal Government has by its actions . . . contributed substantially to the growth and development not only of its own power but to the expansion and strength of private organizational power, the Republican Party believes that Federal Government must begin to consider and adopt measures designed to halt this dehumanizing trend in our society."

Regarding negativism as the chief political curse of modern conservatism, the Goldwater forces want to meet every liberal program with a considerably different conservative alternative—even if the alternative involves Federal action. Although the fact goes unmentioned in the manifesto, Mr. Goldwater is preparing to end his uncompromising opposition to the Federal minimum wage, F deral aid to education, Federal aid to economically-depressed areas and Federal medical care for the aged. He won't copy the Eisenhower-Nixon or Rockefeller approach of offering scaled-down replicas of many Democratic programs, but is trying to devise wholly new proposals for Federal assistance; these may demonstrate the Senator's turn from rigid conservatism more vividly than the manifesto itself.

Inherent in the Goldwater manifesto is an interpretation of last November's vote 180 degrees opposed to the analysis by supporters of Gov. Rockefeller and other Republican liberals. The Rockefeller wing argues the overwhelming Negro and Jewish vote for Mr. Kennedy demonstrates the G.O.P. must redouble its efforts to woo the minority blocs by battling zealously for civil rights. Mr. Goldwater's friends believe the election proved the Negro and Jewish votes to be irreversibly Democratic. Thus, the Senator plans no sweeping initiative in the civil rights fields. In fact, the manifesto repudiates the 1960 Republican platform by bucking any tightening of Senate rules against the filibuster—the South's potent weapon in battling civil rights legislation.

But neither does the manifesto look toward a realignment aimed at a new conservative party combining Southern Democrats and right-wing Republicans. There is no mention of "states' rights," that slogan so dear to Dixie. Nor is there a sign of sympathy for the South's racial integration headaches; defense of the filibuster is based on its potential but generally untried value as a bludgeon against "spend-thrift" Democratic policies.

For the best samples of the Goldwater departures from rigid conservatism, many of which do not appear in the manifesto, witness his still-embryonic alternatives to liberal social welfare plans.

EDUCATION: Sen. Goldwater currently opposes all Federal aid to education. In the manifesto, tax deductions are suggested for parents of college students who earn not more than $20,000 annually in net taxable income. But beyond this, he is considering a two-part plan of Federal action.

One aspect would permit all taxpayers to deduct all or part of property tax payments earmarked for education from the Federal income tax they otherwise would pay; present law permits deduction of local tax payments from gross income for the minority of taxpayers who itemize their deductions. If the plan worked as expected, local government units, no longer anticipating Federal grants, would increase property taxes to bring in more money for schools. Uncle Sam, in effect, would underwrite local education by accepting a loss in income tax revenues.

The other aspect would provide Federal payments for college scholarships. But eligibility would be limited to graduates of second-

(See GOLDWATER....Page 5)

The Second Battle of New Orleans

By Thurman Sensing (Executive Vice President, Southern States Industrial Council.)

GOVERNMENT WITHOUT CONSENT

While Americans spend $40 billion a year to protect the nation from foreign aggressors, the rights of U.S. citizens are withering away at home.

This is the meaning of the tragic second battle of New Orleans between the Louisiana legislature and the Federal judiciary. It is an unequal battle, for on one side -- the side of the state authority -- is simply the solemn assurance of our country's political tradition that the Republic will be based on the consent of the governed. On the other side -- the side of the courts -- is the arrogance of judges who believe that nothing may be permitted to stand in the way of their edicts and who act confidently in the knowledge that the total power of the nation, including bayonets, will be used to implement their will.

And thus it has been that the legitimate voice of the people of Louisiana -- the legislature of that state -- has been blanketed by the most high-handed abuse directed against a sovereign state in modern times. Though the Constitution of the United States contains no provision whatsoever for Federal operation of a state's school system, the Federal courts in Louisiana have gone to extreme lengths to act as a super school board. The courts have held state officials in contempt because the latter sought to operate the schools as the taxpayers wished them to be operated. Banking institutions in New Orleans have been forced to submit to court demands that state funds be spent in a manner not approved by state agencies.

There is only one word that fits the situation. That is the word "tyranny." Louisiana, in the eyes of the courts, is without fundamental rights as though it were some Persian satrapy under Roman rule long ago.

Americans who live in regions outside the South can't seem to understand how shocked and offended Southerners are at the invasion of states rights in Louisiana. It is no wonder, for the reporting of the school dispute in New Orleans has been even more distorted than usual.

Throughout the early weeks of the dispute, wire services and individual Northern newspapers and magazines distributed dozens of stories that presented the integrationists as heroic folk and the believers in separate schools -- the majority of Louisiana citizens -- as primitives with no sense of justice or decency. The State of Louisiana was cruelly libelled, but there is no way to have the libel corrected in the court of public opinion.

Yet one can be sure that those Americans who approved of the drastic measures used against the State of Louisiana will, in time, pay for their harsh and unreasoning attitude. They will pay because it is impossible to deprive the people of Louisiana of their rights without also depriving other Americans of their rights. The dictatorial orders issued by the federal courts in New Orleans will haunt other regions in the years ahead. They will serve as legal precedents for high-handed judges elsewhere in the nation.

Have we fallen so low that we shall destroy completely the principle of states rights, the cornerstone of government on which our founding fathers so wisely builded? If so, we can forget our ideals and tell our traditional form of government goodbye. One can be quite sure the Communists would like to see this happen; they know it would be much easier to subvert a centralized government than the governments of fifty states.

Harvard 'Liberals' And 'Operation Abolition'

The Harvard "liberal," that peculiar breed of political animal that leans constantly to the left, has enlisted in another "great cause." Although not nearly so dramatic as the defense of Communists and fellow travelers, the "cause" will be played for all its worth.

Latest target of the Harvard "liberals" is a Navy Department film of riots at the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in San Francisco last May. It seems the film is too revealing of the type of people who protested the committee hearings.

We have the word of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that the San Francisco riots were Communist-inspired, but that didn't satisfy the "liberals" who protested the recent showing of the film "Operation Abolition" to Harvard NROTC members.

In their denunciations of any and all congressional committees that investigate communism the "liberals" constantly assure us that "this is a job for the FBI." But when the FBI steps into any controversy, the "liberals" show their true colors by attacking that agency as well.

"Operation Abolition" is a film that should be seen by every American, particularly college students.

At Tulane University recently the Circle K. Club, a Kiwanis-sponsored service group, inaugurated a "Citizenship Emphasis" program which included showing of the "Operation Abolition" film. The showing was bitterly protested by the so-called Council of Racial Equality—another great "liberal" organization.

In Arizona, meanwhile, the American Civil Liberties Union, has pulled out all stops in its drive to stop the film being shown in high schools, colleges and over television.

"Liberals," of course, deplore "censorship"—except when THEY are doing the censoring. They also believe in "academic freedom"—but not for the presentation of documented facts that would explode the myths they seek to perpetuate.

(from the Manchester (N.H.) UNION-LEADER)

FEDERAL AID UNNECESSARY

Since World War II the states have built, without federal help, 680,000 classrooms—more than half of all in use.

Teachers have increased by 47.6 per cent in the last ten years. Pupils have increased by 44.9 per cent.

Teachers' salaries have nearly doubled—up 99.8 per cent—while the cost of living index has increased 23.6 per cent.

Public school spending by the states jumped from $5.8 billion to $15.5 billion—167.9 per cent—in the decade.

School spending per pupil during the same time rose from $260.37 to $481.48 a year.

In the face of all the arguments that federal aid is necessary to preserve public education, it appears that the states have been doing a pretty good job for their youth.

(Reprinted from THE STATE, Columbia, S. C.)

What, No Federal Roads?

Guest editorial in the form of an advertisement by the firm of Warner & Swasey of Cleveland, precision machinery since 1880.

* * *

No subsidies? No guaranteed prices for buffalo hides? No free pensions?

No. All that those American pioneers had to go on was character; all they traveled 2,000 hard miles for was the opportunity for hard work. And that is what conquered deserts and mountains; that is what made America.



Those real Americans would have been ashamed to ask for something for nothing; they would have scorned those who demand pay for no work.

If all this country wants is more and more pay for less and less work, we're setting ourselves up as easy victims for more work at less pay—and pay in rubles.

Food For Thought

If everyone didn't have "rights" this item from The Conservative might be humorous: **"A Congo neutralist is one who is non-partisan as to whom he eats."**

HOW REPUBLICAN ROCKEFELLER CONTROLS DEMOCRAT KENNEDY'S FOREIGN POLICY

Two-Party System Destroyed

By Kent Courtney, Publisher

Although the American people dutifully went to the polls on November 8th to vote their choice for President, it has now become clear that the man behind the scenes, the man who actually holds the power to control the foreign and fiscal policy of the United States of America is Nelson Rockefeller.

The name Rockefeller has for generations been associated with enormous wealth. In the 20's it became associated with philanthropy. In 1958, when Nelson Rockefeller was elected Governor of New York, the name Rockefeller for the first time became openly associated with politics. What is the secret of Nelson Rockefeller's phenomenal political success? How was Rockefeller able to hold the controlling influence over both 1960 Democratic and Republican platforms? (It will be recalled that Rockefeller men headed the platform committees of both major parties).

Nelson Rockefeller is well aware that it is not the mere quantity of money which can guarantee political control. It is the way in which that money is utilized. The infiltration of key policy-making positions of both the Democratic and the Republican parties, plus the infiltration of the government itself by the Liberal-Socialist-Internationalist clique is the direct result of the activities during the past two or three decades of the giant tax-exempt foundations such as those originally set up by John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, etc.

Mr. Kennedy may think he will be President of the United States, but he will soon find that he is President in name only should he attempt to thwart the wishes of the Internationalist brain-trusters who have now managed to infiltrate all vital departments of the United States Government.

The accompanying article points out the interlocking relationships between the giant tax-free foundations and how they pool their personnel and finances in order to concentrate and streamline their activities.

Foremost in the field of foreign policy is the Rockefeller Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, both under the control of Nelson Rockefeller.

The general public had not realized the immense power of Nelson Rockefeller until he demonstrated his political control of the Republican Party by summoning Vice President Nixon to New York prior to the Republican Convention in 1960. At this meeting, which has been called the "Munich" of the Republican party, Nelson Rockefeller laid down in no uncertain terms his demands regarding the Republican platform. These demands, it will be recalled, necessitated a complete rewriting of the platform, which had already been drafted.

Nelson Rockefeller is nominally a member of the Republican Party. However, Kennedy's cabinet appointments expose the myth that there is still a two-party system in this country. We find that all key foreign policy posts in the Kennedy Administration have been assigned to Rockefeller men, men who have been or are now associated with Rockefeller's enterprises in one way or another. All have in common a belief in the globalist policies propounded by the Rockefeller Foundations.

Below is a list of key foreign policy posts in the new Kennedy Administration, together with organizations or foundations with which each appointee is, or has been, associated.

STATE DEPARTMENT

(1) DEAN RUSK, Secretary of State: Chairman, Rockefeller Foundation (now on one year's leave of absence); member of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations;

(2) CHESTER BOWLES, Under Secretary of State: Director of the Rockefeller Foundation; Trustee, Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Member, National Committee for UNESCO; Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

(3) DOUGLAS DILLON, Secretary of the Treasury: Trustee, Rockefeller Foundation; Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

(4) ROSWELL GILPATRIC, Deputy Secretary of Defense: Trustee, Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

(5) JOHN J. McCLOY, Director of U.S. Disarmament Commission: Director, Rockefeller Foundation; Chairman of the Board, Chase Manhattan Bank; Chairman, Ford Foundation; Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Because the Department of Labor, which once dealt with domestic labor issues, has become international in character due to participation in the International Labor Organization (ILO), it is interesting to note that the foundations have managed to place one of their men in the key spot of Secretary of Labor in the Kennedy administration. We refer, of course, to

(6) ARTHUR GOLDBERG, Secretary of Labor: Member of the Board of Directors of the Ford Fund for the Republic; Member, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (whose President, it will be recalled, was Alger Hiss, until Hiss was convicted of perjury for lying about his Communist affiliations and activities).

The appointment of DEAN RUSK, former chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation, as Secretary of State in the Kennedy Administration, is a clear signal that the policy of appeasement of Communism which Dean Rusk implemented when he was Assistant Secretary of State under Harry Truman, will be continued. Elsewhere in this issue is an article entitled "Dean Rusk - a Bad Record," reprinted from the MANCHESTER UNION LEADER, which outlines Rusk's dangerous naivete regarding the Communist menace.

THE INTERLOCK IN INTERNATIONALISM

The Reece Committee Report on the 1954 investigation of Tax-Exempt Foundations states, "Substantial evidence indicates there is more than a mere close working together among some foundations operating in the international field. The Carnegie Corporation, The Carnegie Endowment For International Peace, The Rocke-

(See ROCKEFELLER....Page 6)

Tax-Free Foundations Infiltrate Education and Government to Promote Internationalism

By Phoebe Courtney, Editor

Conservative students of government have long been aware of the increasing power of the giant tax-free foundations. In the accompanying article you will find specific examples indicating that the foundations have now become so powerful that they are able to place their key men in cabinet posts regardless of which party happens to be in power.

HOW DID THE TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS ACHIEVE THIS ENORMOUS POLITICAL POWER?

In this article we will attempt to trace briefly the rise of the foundations to their present commanding position. Facts in this article are based on the 1954 hearings of the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, headed by Congressman B. Carroll Reece, and also on the very authoritative book entitled FOUNDATIONS: THEIR POWER AND INFLUENCE, by Rene A. Wormser, who served as General Counsel to the Reece Committee.

John O'Donnell, columnist in the NEW YORK DAILY NEWS, stated on Dec. 21, 1954, that "the huge fortunes piled up by such industrial giants as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Henry Ford, are today being used to destroy or discredit the free enterprise system which gave them birth."

The Reece Committee's investigation of tax-exempt foundations revealed that foundation funds are used for political ends, and that these tax-exempt foundations concentrated economic power and cultural influence in the hands of a class of administrators, an elite group which operates outside of democratic processes. These foundation administrators, with millions of dollars at their disposal, are attempting to shape the future of this nation and of mankind in the image of their own concepts. Many of the foundations have interlocking directorates, and thereby are able to multiply the power of their influence by pooling the vast funds at their disposal.

The administrators of this vast concentration of millions of dollars are beholden to no one. They and the foundations have set themselves above the United States government. Rene Wormser states in his excellent book, FOUNDATIONS: THEIR POWER AND INFLUENCE, "Unlike the power of corporate management, it (the interlocking and self-perpetuating group of foundations) is unchecked by stockholders; unlike the power of government, it is unchecked by the people; unlike the power of churches, it is unchecked by any firmly established canons of value."

Because the giant foundations are a law unto themselves, they are free to conduct any activities they wish in support of any political concept they wish, even though such a concept may be inimical to American freedom and Constitutional government. Increasingly the foundations have devoted their activities to the promotion of the following: the Welfare State, World Government, impairment of U. S. national sovereignty, defense of subversive elements in this nation; and even - yes - even a re-writing of the U. S. Constitution which would destroy traditional safeguards of individual liberty.

FOUNDATIONS EXERT INCREASING CONTROL OVER EDUCATION

Enormous sums of money and tremendous efforts have been exerted by the foundations in the field of education, from the college level on down to grade school, with the intent of indoctrinating the youth of this nation in the Socialist Internationalist concept promulgated by the foundations. So extensive have been the

(See FOUNDATIONS.....Page 6)

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

Published approximately every four to six weeks by
FREE MEN SPEAK, INC.
7314 Zimpel Street New Orleans 18, Louisiana

Kent H. Courtney . . . . . President
Phoebe Greene Courtney . . . . . Editor and Secty.-Treasurer
Mary Helen Brengel . . . . . Assistant Editor
Entered as third class matter at the New Orleans Post Office

Copyright 1961 by THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: One year (or 12 issues): $3.00; two years (or 24 issues): $5.00.

OUR POLICY

This newspaper is dedicated to the defeat of Socialist and Communist influences that now pervade the thinking and the policies of our Federal government and the two major political parties. We believe that there is no difference between a New Deal Democrat and a Socialist-Internationalist Republican.

This newspaper will continue to promote all individuals and organizations who believe that a new political party based on Constitutional States Rights is the answer to the Socialism that has captured both (formerly great) parties.

We will never align ourselves with any person or group which preaches hatred. Instead we will conserve our energy for the fight against atheistic Communism, and we pledge ourselves to LOVE OF GOD AND AN INDEPENDENT U.S.A.

OUR THANKS

Because we are political and "controversial" we have no advertising income. We therefore thank all of our readers who send donations every week so that more and more sample copies can be sent to patriots throughout the country. Without this regular support, this experiment in patriotic and political journalism would not be possible.

TRAGEDY IN NEW ORLEANS

(Reprinted from the Indianapolis (Ind.) NEWS)

The tragedy which has gripped the city of New Orleans is grim testimony to what men can do when they try to coerce one another into virtue.

Under federal pressure to integrate its schools, New Orleans was turned into an armed camp. UPI reported: "Carloads of Negroes roamed the city streets . . . shooting wildly at white pedestrians . . . one white man was shot in the hand by a gang of Negroes . . . pedestrians had to dash into shop doorways when a car carrying three Negroes careened through downtown streets. Police said shots were fired from the car before it overturned . . . A Negro with a knife slash across his chest said his attacker was a white youth."

White students walked out of New Orleans schools. The Legislature cut off school funds.

When government action brings events of this sort, it behooves us all to examine its policies and its objectives with care. Is what the federal government wants to do in New Orleans capable of attainment? Is its action successful enough to justify the destruction of civic order?

*** ***

THE STATED OBJECT of school integration is to promote the welfare of the Negro in the South. The real result has been to marshal economic pressures against Negroes, to inflame latent prejudice, to incite racial violence. Moreover, it would seem the integration effort has not achieved the explicit point on which the entire struggle has been staked.

Until the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, Southern schools were governed by the doctrine that "separate but equal" facilities had to be provided for both Negroes and whites. The court said this was not good enough; from the very fact of being schooled in a different building, it argued, Negro pupils would perceive the whites did not want to associate with them, and so feel discriminated against. "Separate educational facilities," the court concluded, "are inherently unequal."

The object of all the bitter struggle, therefore, is the psychological security of the Negro student. Waiving the problem of whether a decision so constructed is constitutional let us what the actual results have been.

Does a six-year-old girl led through a screaming mob under armed guard feel psychologically secure? Do three Negro children sitting alone in an empty school believe they have been accepted? Even in areas where token integration has been achieved, do the Negro students, grudgingly admitted under massive pressure, feel they have been received as equals?

*** ***

IF IT IS the psychological welfare of the Negro child we must consider, nothing could be more harmful than to use innocent children as shock troops in a major social revolution.

"The end of discrimination, in the psychological sense which so concerned the court, can come only when the white people of the South want it to come. If they do not want it, there is no way to force them into willing compliance.

National Thought Control

"Education must be controlled at the local level by local people better able to determine local needs than a group of Washington... bureaucrats. Federal aid cannot be administered without developing federal control. He who controls the purse strings becomes the master. The next step after central control is national thought control with no way to stop it."

--Hillsboro (Ore.) ARGUS

Straight Talk

by Tom Anderson

(Reprinted from FARM & RANCH MAGAZINE)

What Have You Done For Us Lately?

After traveling in 23 nations (12 of them with Secretary Benson), I am more than ever convinced that Uncle Sam is Uncle Sucker. On Benson's Trade Development tours, I have been struck by the oneness of attitude of all foreign nations with us. We ask them, "What can we do for you?" and they ask us, "What can you do for us?" They all have their hand out. They want to take all and give nothing. They're all looking out for Number One, while our leaders sanctimoniously proclaim our belief in world brotherhood. After we've dumped $70 billion in aid all over the world, our world brothers ask, "What have you done for us lately?"

We always help our friends when they're in trouble, and they never forget us when they're in trouble again. But now we're in trouble. We've "lost" much of our gold. Our dollar is in danger. Our debt is astronomical. Britain, West Germany, France and others we've helped to their highest level of prosperity now refuse to join us not only in shouldering part of the aid to the have-not nations, but also refuse to pay their fair share for their own defense. Uncle Sucker defends them, at his own expense, from Communist invasion. Some call our foreign aid "enlightened self-interest." I call it Moochual Security.

Kennedy's "New Frontier" is Socialism. Socialism is Communism without the firing squad. Before the "New Frontier," first introduced as the "New Deal," government prevented one man from robbing another. Now government robs one man for the benefit of another. How appropriate that Roosevelt's likeness on our dimes replaced the goddess of Liberty.

Kennedy asks for unity. He won't get it because he doesn't deserve it—any more than Norman Thomas, Walter Reuther or any other Socialist. Kennedy was "elected" by a well-oiled, multi-million-dollar campaign, based on destructive, seductive appeal to minority groups and on crooked big city machines. (Alarmists are worrying unnecessarily about future and worse vote frauds. Under Kennedy, even if we still have elections, a dollar won't buy a vote any more.) His "victory" was not a mandate but a default by an opponent who tried to tip-toe into the White House, Dewey-like, with a me-too, we-can-do-it-better-and-cheaper campaign.

Along with millions of Americans who'll refuse to "unite" behind a collectivist with a police state mentality, I believe in neither "going along," nor going away. I intend to oppose Kennedy and his Socialist brain trust every step of the way.

The Wave Is What You Make It

Kennedy promises to plan, ban, lend, spend us out of our freedoms. If the lamp of freedom is blown out in America, the world will be thrown into darkness. With the Kennedy dynasty ruling our lives, I agree, for the first time, that the main issue is religion: God Save America.

Many materialists, cowards, ostriches and switch hitters say, "I can't openly engage in politics because of my business." The politics we're engaged in today is the politics of survival as a free people. We're being spent, planned, maneuvered, cheated and "neutralized" out of our freedoms.

People who neither agree nor disagree, who refuse to fight for the right, who stay in the middle of the road wherever the middle is, who believe in peace at any price, who refuse to take a stand because it might lose business or alienate friends, remind me of Dante's classic indictment: "The hottest fires of hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain neutrality."

Thurmond Hints Of Third Party

WASHINGTON — Sen. Strom Thurmond warned Saturday that a third major political party could spring up in the United States before the 1964 presidential elections unless the two dominant existing parties realign along liberal versus conservative lines.

Thurmond, who in 1948 won 39 electoral votes as a third party candidate for president, made it plain that he prefers the country's traditional two-party system of government.

But he said that system cannot survive unless the Democratic and Republican parties realign without regard to existing names, labels or symbols. He said the two new parties which would result from such realignment should have entirely new names.

"If they don't realign," Thurmond told reporters, "a strong, conservative party will arise."

Thurmond would not say what role, if any, he would play in the formation of such a third party. But he did say he is not now engaged in any planning for a third party, and did not know of any planning that is under way.

The South Carolina senator indicated that if such a third party does emerge, he thought the country would in time return to the two-party system. He said that if a strong, conservative party should arise in the face of failure of the existing parties to overhaul their structures, "it will eventually become one of the two major parties, because the other two will merge."

(Charleston, S. C. NEWS & COURIER of 1/7/61)

RED-LED RIOTS

BY CONGRESSMAN H. R. GROSS

Through the years, a primary target of the left-wing press in this country has been the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Currently under attack by this segment of the press is a film produced by the Committee showing Communist-inspired riots against the Committee in San Francisco in May of this year.

Despite irrefutable evidence that the riots were Communist-inspired, the film has been bitterly attacked by such left-wing publications as The Washington Post and The Reporter magazine.

"Forgery by film", was the cry of the Washington Post. The newspaper editorialized that attributing the riots to Communists "is wholly unjustified".

The newspaper thus ignores a well-documented report, entitled "Communist Target-Youth", by J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The report outlines in detail how the Reds planned, staged and participated in the stormy demonstrations at the Committee's hearings.

"The Communist attack on the HCUA (House Committee on Un-American Activities) was in line with a longstanding party aim to destroy not only the HCUA, but also the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and every other 'enemy' seeking to expose the threat which the Communist activities represent to the internal security of this Nation," Hoover's report states.

The Communist Party plan of attack had two important objectives, according to Hoover. The first was to fill the scene of the hearings with demonstrators and the second was to incite them to action through the use of mob psychology.

Was the plan successful? Read the following, taken from Hoover's report:

"The Communist Party, USA, is elated with the success it enjoyed in attempting to make a fiasco of the HCUA San Francisco hearings....The party's elation is so great, in fact, that it bears witness to the truth of the observation that such a Communist coup has not occurred in the San Francisco area in 25 years.

"Immediately after the affair ended, the party's national leader, Gus Hall, congratulated the West Coast comrades for the initiative and leadership they displayed at all stages of the demonstrations.

"The Communists demonstrated at San Francisco just how powerful a weapon Communist infiltration is. They revealed how it is possible for only a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, to turn peaceful demonstrations into riots. Their success there must serve as a warning that their infiltration efforts aimed not only at the youth and student groups, but also at our labor unions, churches, professional groups, artists, newspapers, government, and the like, can create chaos and shatter our internal security.

"Throughout the world today, governments are toppling with stunning rapidity. Whether large or small, the role Communists are playing in these events must not be discounted.

"Looking at the riots and chaos Communists have created in other countries, many Americans point to the strength of our Nation and say, 'It can't happen here.' The Communist success in San Francisco in May, 1960, proves that it can happen here."

(Editor's Note: The documentary film referred to above, entitled "Operation Abolition," was produced by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. THE CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS, which has viewed the film, states that it "gives clear pictorial proof of how Communist agitation has been behind efforts to block investigation of subversion . . . The film shows Communists and pro-Communists - clearly identified - at work stirring up student agitators, shouting in the House Un-American Activities Committee hearing room, beating on the hearing room doors, rioting and chanting, and finally fighting with police officers when the Red-stirred demonstration became violent . . . ."

This revealing film, "Operation Abolition" is being sponsored and shown by American Legion posts, Chambers of Commerce, and civic organizations all over the United States. If you wish to rent this film "Operation Abolition," in order to show it to your friends or group, send $10.00 to Mr. J. Dohn Lewis, Editor, THE AMERICAN STATESMAN, 345 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. When writing Mr. Lewis, please list three dates a month in advance when you would like to show the film. Mr. Lewis will immediately reply as to what date the film will be available to you. For further information as to how you can rent the film "Operation Abolition," contact Mr. J. Dohn Lewis at the address shown above.)

Planting Deeply

Delegates to the recent American Farm Bureau Federation convention wholeheartedly planted the roots of their doctrine deep in conservative soil, adopting proposals which might well have come from Thomas Jefferson's notebook.

The farm group, the largest in the United States, went on record as opposing further Federal aid for education, called for less Federal spending and a balanced budget, and demanded a curb on the Supreme Court's tendency to invade the legislative field. In addition, the delegates demanded an end to government intervention in agriculture, pointing to the election returns as evidence that the "farm belt" does not favor restrictive government programs.

Among the statements adopted by the farm organization, was one which said, "The Farm Bureau believes that the centralization of power and authority in the Federal government, the movement to socialize America, the apathy of the American people toward this trend . . . are among the greatest dangers threatening our republic and our system of competitive enterprise."

Unlike many large organizations, the farm bureau delegates clearly assessed the major problems confronting our nation, and they proposed realistic solutions. Regardless of whether they are enacted, the organization deserves the thanks of all conservative Americans.

(Reprinted from Indianapolis (Ind.) STAR)

The Demolition of Operation Abolition

Washington, Jan. 3. The Communist-supported drive to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities has failed. While no objective observer ever expected the House of Representatives would actually abolish the Committee, the failure of Operation Abolition was far more complete than anyone could dare to hope. Rep. James Roosevelt (D.-Cal.), who was scheduled to enter a resolution calling for the abolition of HUAC on the opening day of Congress, announced over the New Year's weekend that he had reconsidered, and would ask only for closer scrutiny of the Committee's appropriations. And the mass abolitionist rally (January 2, in Washington) turned instead into a demonstration of support for the Committee--with pro-HUAC pickets outnumbering the anti-HUAC forces nearly 2 to 1.

Young Americans for Freedom sent several busloads of enthusiastic young people from New York to counter the moves of the Operation Abolition forces. They were joined in the capital by delegations and members of other organizations, from Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia. Totalling more than 400, they picketed the abolitionist pickets at Lafayette Park, adjacent to the White House. They were greeted on Capitol Hill by Rep. Francis E. Walter, chairman of the House Committee. They picketed again when Dr. Willard Uphaus addressed the abolitionists that evening.

In the abolitionist camp, only 212 pickets turned up, according to police count, though previous estimates and predictions had ranged from 500 to 2,000. Faces were glum. Not only had Jimmy Roosevelt backed out on them; they now had to face the new experience of being picketed themselves, and of being outnumbered at that.

Their evening meeting looked more like a funeral than a rally. Some listened apathetically and others slept while Burton White, Aubrey Williams and Dr. Uphaus went through their regular scripts. Dr. Uphaus, fresh out of jail in New Hampshire, may have stumbled onto a new national movement, when he reported that "thousands of prisoners" were being kept behind bars in sub-standard jails; but the program was pretty flat. The evening's activities ended as the picketers filed silently into their buses. The air was filled not with the radical-labor songs they usually sing, but with the resounding chants of the anti-Communist pickets that surrounded their buses.

An important aspect of the affair is the fact that this was the first experience of Young Americans for Freedom in organizing a picket line; and they planned it for only two weeks, whereas the radical Left had been planning its demonstrations for months, and had years of experience. A policeman remarked that "this is the first time we've seen anything like this--where the anti-Communists are in the majority." The policemen were among the first to experience the subtle change occurring in the country: the passing of the initiative in political propaganda from the youth of the Left to the youth of the Right.

(Editor's Note: Additional information regarding the organization YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM may be obtained by writing to Mr. Douglas Caddy, National Director, YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM, 343 Lexington Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.)

(Reprinted from the NATIONAL REVIEW)

DEAN RUSK

A Bad Record

Certainly one common sense basis of judging what a man will do in the future is to take a look at what he has done in the past. In the case of President-elect Kennedy's newly designated secretary of state, Dean Rusk, we believe our readers will most fervently hope that this is not so.

Fulton Lewis Jr. points to some of Dean Rusk's actions in the past as follows:

"Before the Korean War, Rusk publicly stated that the Communist Chinese Revolution does not aim at a dictatorship. He likened the Chinese Revolution to the American Revolution. It would be hard to find a more stupid analysis or one more insulting to the American people.

"Next, after the Chinese Communists entered the Korean War, Rusk said he did not know whether this was part of a pattern of worldwide aggression.

"Then, again, Rusk supported Truman and Acheson (against General MacArthur) in their refusal to carry the Korean War to Red China. He agreed fully with Truman's dismissal of MacArthur.

"As late as March 1953, speaking before the National Education Association, Rusk attacked congressional investigations into communism.

"Finally Rusk was instrumental in drawing up, about 12 months ago, in December 1959, the Rockefeller Foundation Report, virtually calling for recognition of Red China."

It may be that Rusk has had a sudden conversion in the past 12 months, but if not and if he carries out future policies based on his past viewpoints, **HEAVEN HELP THE UNITED STATES.**

(Reprinted from the Manchester (N.H.) UNION-LEADER)

It the Dealers had their way, "Stars And Stripes Forever" would have a new title— "Foreign Aid Forever."

Listen to the RADIO EDITION of The INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

STATE	CITY	STATION	KILOCYCLES	DAY	TIME
ALABAMA	Selma	WHBB	1490	Sunday	6:00 P.M.
FLORIDA	Panama City	WDLP	590	Saturday	7:45 A.M.
ILLINOIS	La Grange,	WTAQ	1300	Date and time to be announced	
LOUISIANA	Bastrop	KVOB	1340	Monday	6:30 A.M.
	New Orleans	WSMB	1350	Thursday	6:00 P.M.
	Ruston	KRUS	1490	Sunday	6:15 P.M.
	Shreveport	KWKH	1130	Monday	7:15 P.M.
MISSISSIPPI	Grenada	WNAG	1400	Monday	6:15 P.M.
NORTH CAROLINA	Mount Airy	WPAQ	740	Saturday	5:15 P.M.
	Burlington	WBAG		Sunday	12:45 P.M.
	High Point	WHPE	1070	Sunday	12:45 P.M.
SOUTH CAROLINA	Greenville	WMUU	1260	Saturday	1:30 P.M.
TEXAS	Kermit	KERB	600	Sunday	12:30 P.M.
	Midland	KJBC	1150	Monday	12:00 Noon
VIRGINIA	Charlottesville	WCHV	1260	Tuesday	1:00 P.M.
	Lawrenceville	WLES	680	Saturday	9:00 A.M.
	Lynchburg	WBRG	1050		
	Petersburg	WPVA	1290	Sunday	1:45 P.M.
WASHINGTON	Tacoma	KTWR	103.9 Mc	Tuesday	6:45 P.M.
WISCONSIN	Manitowoc	WOMT	1240	Monday	6:45 P.M.
WYOMING	Buffalo	KBBS	1450	Wednesday	6:30 P.M.

The purpose of THE RADIO EDITION OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN is to give the Conservative side of the vital issues concerning this country today

CONSERVATIVE PROGRAMS AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL SPONSORSHIP

If you and your friends, or your business firm, would like to have these programs played over your local radio station, just write to Kent Courtney, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans 18, Louisiana, for complete details.

HELP SPREAD THE WORD

Every month, in order to combat the millions of words spewed out by the left-wing press, THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN distributes thousands of free sample copies.

These sample copies are paid for by the contributions sent in by our supporters, who wish in this way, to fight against the Socialists who have infiltrated every part of our government.

If you believe in the work we are doing, and if you wish to help us spread the message of Americanism contained in THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, then please contribute to our "Distribution Fund" to help finance these free sample copies.

Just make your check out to The Independent American, 7314 Zimpel St., New Orleans, La.

CONSERVATIVE PARTY ON RADIO IN N.C.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY of NORTH CAROLINA and the many businessmen affiliated with it are using mass media of communication to reach the citizens and the voters. They sponsor radio programs of conservative news and opinion and take out newspaper advertisements asking the people to listen to these radio programs. THEY ARE GETTING RESULTS IN OBTAINING ADDITIONAL VOLUNTEER WORKERS FOR THE PARTY. Here is their radio schedule of programs:

CITY	STATION	TIME	DAY	ON YOUR DIAL
BURLINGTON	WBAG	12:45	Sunday	1150
HIGH POINT	WHPE	12:45	Sunday	1070
HIGH POINT	WMFR	1:00	Monday	1230
MOUNT AIRY	WPAQ	5:15	Saturday	740

By means of this notice we suggest that all subscribers in NORTH CAROLINA who wish to get active politically volunteer their services to Mr. A. G. Whitener and Mr. W. S. Griffith to help form local committees of THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY throughout all of North Carolina. Just drop a letter to THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY, Box 1346, High Point, North Carolina or Box 312, Rocky Mount, North Carolina. When you send one dollar or more you will receive a bumper sticker for your car, a membership card, and a copy of the petition.

The American Way Of Life

"There is a specific definition for The American Way of life. It is acceptable to all Americans, whatever their race, creed or color, whatever their calling, whatever their economic station in life. We can all rally around it and defend it, if we know about it and understand it.

"An acceptable definition is: A social system built upon the foundation of Faith in God, with a governmental system anchored to the United States Constitution (a Republic), and with a capitalistic economic system having as its keystones the principles of private ownership of property, the competitive market, and the profit motive.

"It can be put even more simply: Faith in God, Constitutional Government, Private Enterprise. Here are the three great pillars of our American system."

-- Dr. George S. Benson, Pres. of Harding College

Are Churchmen Burying Us?

(Reprinted from the Tulsa (Okla.) WORLD)

The National Council of Churches is the nation's largest Christian organization. Its membership is made up of representatives from 33 Protestant and Orthodox denominations.

The Council met last week in San Francisco, and we are impelled to the conclusion that a more weak-kneed, ill-advised and faithless conclave it would be impossible to imagine.

As a result of actions taken by the Council we believe every American church member who hasn't the time or the inclination to read his daily newspaper, or assimilate the meaning of the things that are going on around him, ought at this very moment to commune with his preacher and the leadership of his church--not to seek guidance but to offer guidance!

Why do we feel so strongly on this?

Well, first we'll quote from an Associated Press report on the Council meeting:

"The United States may soon have to subordinate its will to that of the United Nations. Citizens must be prepared to take it."

Now, let's quote from a resolution on the subject of U.S. subordination which was adopted by the Council membership.

"We believe citizens should prepare themselves for such eventuality. It would not then be an undue shock to public opinion, since people would have a more mature view, better able to interpret democracy at work on a world scale, with the benefit as well as the risk that the extension of democracy always entails."

There it is, in a nutshell--the United States in the process of being sold down the river by some of its highest, most respected churchmen.

We can scarcely believe it. We cannot understand by what process some of the finest brains in all of Christianity have become so confused, so soft, that they would subvert this nation to the will of the polyglot that makes up the United Nations. We are asked to surrender ourselves, our freedoms, our dreams, to the will of non-believers, to ignoramuses barely emerging from the Dark Ages, and to despots who speak loudly before the assemblage of nations we call the UN.

Surely the religious leaders of this nation cannot believe that to submit to United Nations omnipotence is the "mature" thing to do, or that the majority of the UN represents "democracy" at work.

Are 200 years of faith and work and hope to be sacrificed before the altar of nations who have been unable to duplicate the masterworks that are the possession of the people of the United States? What have we been fighting for? The things we have achieved through our work and prayers--are they no longer considered important enough to preserve? Is it no longer fashionable to be free and American? Is it no longer Christian to hold fast to the sovereignty of one home, one nation, one GOD?

No Personal Income Tax?

A lot of attention has been attracted by the Kennedy "task force" suggestion of a temporary 3 or 4 percent point cut in individual income taxes as a recession measure--even though there is no suggestion of a commensurate cut in Federal spending to avoid deficit financing and increased costly debt. Not many Americans may be aware, however, of a very serious and much more sound suggestion that the individual income tax be abolished completely and permanently as a part of a program which has the virtue of avoiding deficit financing and increased debt.

We have become so accustomed to the income tax and its confiscatory rates that it sounds impossible to talk of abolishing it. But it could be abolished if the American people really demanded the right to spend their own money for their own needs rather than have centralized, socialized, welfare state government take it from them to spend as it sees fit.

Lest anyone think the idea of abolishing the personal income tax is just a crackpot scheme that somebody has dreamed up, it should be noted that the legislatures of Wyoming, Texas, Nevada and Louisiana have actually adopted resolutions calling for a "23rd Amendment" to the Constitution to bring about income tax abolition. And Arizona, Michigan and Mississippi have taken preliminary steps to do so.

The proposed constitutional amendment reads:

"Section 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"Section 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"Section 3. The activities of the United States Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of three (3) years from the date of ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"Section 4. Three (3) years after the ratification of this amendment, the 16th Article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

The language of the proposed amendment points to the way the income tax abolition could be practical. The National Committee for Economic Freedom, which is sponsoring the amendment, explains that this amendment would require the Federal Government to get out of all operations that the Constitution does not specifically provide for it to be in.

By selling the land and assets of these prohibited activities to the American people, the Federal Government would realize proceeds sufficient to reduce the present 293-billion-dollar national debt by about 65 billion dollars. Based on the 1960 budget, this would reduce interest on the remaining debt (and thus reduce the tax burden) by nearly two billion dollars.

The National Committee for Economic Freedom (you may write it for full information at 6413 Franklin Ave., Los Angeles 28, California) shows reductions in spending that would result from getting the Federal Government out of improper commercial, industrial and financial enterprises would completely offset the loss of revenue through personal income tax abolition, leaving enough funds from other regular tax sources to meet the cost of all proper governmental operations, finance the national defense on its current scale--and still leave an estimated surplus of 6.482 billion dollars to be applied toward reduction of the existing national debt.

But that isn't all. By leaving some 37 billion dollars in the hands of the people instead of taking it away through income taxes, funds would be available to stimulate the economy, invest in enterprise, and make new jobs, creating a boom the like of which we have never seen.

No, all of this won't come about overnight. It likely will not come about at all. Why? Because the people won't demand that the Government abandon welfare state schemes and get back to a constitutional basis. But with income tax rates ranging from 20 per cent to 91 per cent, it's at least something everybody could do some thinking about.

(Editor's Note: THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN urges its readers to write for the complete story as to how we can get rid of the Federal personal income tax. Write to the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Ave., Los Angeles 28, Calif. We also suggest that you send to THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR or THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, Phoenix, Ariz., for their booklet "The Power to Destroy," which is made up of a series of six editorials regarding the need for the proposed 23rd amendment which appeared in these newspapers. The facts contained in the foregoing editorial, as well as in the additional information which can be obtained, can provide material for letters to the editors of your local newspapers, and for convincing your State legislators of the necessity for YOUR State to adopt a resolution calling for the 23rd Amendment.) (Reprinted from CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS)

SEND NAMES FOR OUR MAILING LIST

PLEASE SEND ONLY NAMES OF PERSONS WHO YOU THINK WOULD BE INTERESTED IN READING THIS NEWSPAPER. WE SHALL BE HAPPY TO SEND THEM A SAMPLE COPY

EDITORIAL ROUND-UP

MEANING OF HOUSING BOSS APPOINTMENT

Below are excerpts from editorials regarding the appointment of Robert C. Weaver as chief U. S. Housing boss:

JACKSON, MISS. "STATE-TIMES"

We can well imagine the reaction of many people throughout the North and East if President-elect John Kennedy had appointed Gov. Orval Faubus as U. S. Attorney General.

The howl which would have come out of New York and Chicago would have lifted the tops off of the houses of those areas.

By the same token the people of the East and North should recognize the reaction of the people of the South to the appointment of Robert C. Weaver, chairman of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as head of the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Weaver is recognized as an authority on housing. But he is also a crusader against separate housing areas for the people of different races.

Obviously this is the case of putting a man of extreme views in a post of authority where he can compel people of opposite views to yield to his demands.

RICHMOND, VA. "NEWS-LEADER"

When Mr. Kennedy tendered the Postmaster-Generalship to a Negro, Congressman William Dawson of Illinois, little protest was heard in the South. The proposal was subject to criticism on many points, chiefly that Dawson has been identified all his life with some of the most sordid ward politics of Chicago; but the offer had the honest plugged-nickel ring of tolerable hypocrisy, and Southerners, who begin learning politics in the nursery, could have forgiven Mr. Kennedy a gesture that every politician recognized as a necessary act.

As it turned out, the gesture did not suffice. Mr. Dawson declined the job, as Mr. Kennedy must have expected him to decline, and the President-elect made no capital with his Negro supporters. They regarded the offer to a 74-year-old man as a sham, which it was, and put new pressure on Mr. Kennedy. If Mr. Kennedy had responded to that pressure by naming a Negro to high office in the State Department, or in Labor or Commerce or Interior, again, Southerners would have remained philosophically quiet.

But when Mr. Kennedy appointed the chairman of the board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the President-elect went beyond the limits of fair politics. Robert C. Weaver, his adminstrator-designate, is a militant Negro crusader for civil rights. His entire adult life has been closely bound up in the promotion of racial integration. If Mr. Kennedy had reached into darkest Mississippi, and proposed to appoint to this highly sensitive post some white executive of the Citizens Council, the outcry from Negro organizations would have been deafening.

As housing administrator, Mr. Weaver would be in direct charge of the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. The policies he would shape, the subordinate executives he would appoint, the contracts he would approve or disapprove -- all these would have profound influence upon homebuilding and property ownership.

CHARLESTON, S. C. "NEWS & COURIER"

Robert C. Weaver, the President-elect's choice for chief of the Federal housing services, will do what he can to remove any vestige of what is called "discrimination" according to race. We say "what is called 'discrimination' " because we do not concede that the doctrine of "separate but equal" is discriminatory. Mr. Weaver, who is chairman of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, is an outspoken advocate of mixed housing. His policy no doubt will dominate the agency.

We have no reason to doubt his familiarity with public housing theories as now practiced, or his sincerity in favor of mingling the races in living quarters. Most Southerners, both white and Negro, are familiar with interracial neighborhoods. They abound in Southern cities. Lines drawn by custom have enabled the races to live side by side with a minimum of tension. Disruption of these lines--sometimes all but invisible--has led to trouble in Northern housing, both public and private.

We know of housing projects -- in Chicago and Buffalo, to mention two Northern cities with which we are familiar -- where racial harmony has suffered by such mingling. In Charleston, white and Negro families live side by side in a federal project where only a narrow street divides the races. Never has a racial incident developed there. We hope that federal housing officials will study this peaceful situation in future planning. Satisfaction of the tenants and harmonious relations are more valuable in our opinion than experiments in doubtful sociology.

CHATTANOOGA "NEWS-FREE PRESS"

The appointment of Dr. Weaver to the housing post is a clear signal of Kennedy Administration determination to increase the pressures for forced racial mixing in every segment of housing where Federal Government can impose its decrees.

Look at the socialized housing projects built with Federal funds. Watch in the months to come the integration pressures that will increase. And this may be only the starting point.

The Weaver appointment was not made just to recognize ability or qualification -- but to promote forced integration in housing.

COLUMBIA, S. C. "THE STATE"

In naming a top-echelon official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, President-elect Kennedy has made it most likely that the field of housing will become deeply embroiled in the desegregation controversy.

Mr. Kennedy knows there will be some Southern opposition. He reportedly "bristled" when the matter of possible Southern objections was brought up at his press conference.

The appointee, Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, said he "was certainly in favor of the idea of open occupancy and non-discrimination in housing."

Translating this "integrationese" into federal policy indicates Weaver will insist on denial of any Federal funds or Federally-guaranteed financing to any projects he thinks might be segregated. He will insist that, as a matter of administrative policy, Federal housing projects will be vehicles for achieving mixing.

In the end, the results of such a policy will undoubtedly be confusion and bitterness and political manipulation. It could even mean disruption of many of the present programs which have made it easier for the average person to purchase a home.

The position to which Kennedy has appointed Weaver is not one from which a Negro should be barred if he has the proper qualifications. But in selecting the chairman of an aggressive pressure group, the President-elect has certainly served warning to the South that it can expect no lessening of NAACP influence for the next four years.

Many people in the South contended before the election that Mr. Kennedy did not mean many of the things he said about achieving integration in all facets of American life.

Will they so-contend tomorrow?

Lincoln on Housing

Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

--Abraham Lincoln

Massive Resistance In New Orleans

On November 30, 1960, the Federal District Court in New Orleans issued injunctions against more than 700 elected officials of the State of Louisiana including all of the members of the State Legislature forbidding them from carrying out their official duties.

However, as of January 18, when this paper goes to press, not one individual has been tried in court or has been put in jail for defying the injunctions of the Federal District Court, although the members of the Legislature have continuously defied the court both by their legislative acts and by their public speeches.

Why has the Federal District Court not brought all of the members of the Louisiana Legislature into court to try them for contempt of the court's injunctions? Could it be that the Federal District Court is well aware that its injunctions against the Legislature of the State of Louisiana are illegal and unconstitutional?

Backing up the State Legislature in its defiance of the unconstitutional acts of the Federal District Court are the parents of the pupils who formerly attended the two schools which were integrated by Court decree on November 14. This resistance on the part of the parents of the pupils who were attending these two public schools has made a mockery of the court's efforts to forcibly integrate the public school system of New Orleans.

The two schools in question had a total enrollment of 1019 pupils. Now, however, at formerly all-white McDonough No. 19 School, the boycott by the white parents is complete; not one white student has ever shown up since the Federal District Court ordered integration last November. This school is now being operated solely for the benefit of three small Negro girls. The entire faculty of 15 to 20 teachers turns up each day in order to teach the three Negro girls. The teachers, of course, are the innocent pawns in this battle between the rights of the State and the power of the Federal judiciary. The teachers must report for work or they will be fired by the New Orleans School Board and would lose their tenure and retirement benefits.

At the William Frantz School only some 12 to 15 white students turn up each day to attend school with the one Negro girl assigned to it by the Federal Court.

When you see the news picture of New Orleans mothers picketing the school in New Orleans and when you see pictures on TV of the mothers booing, they are not demonstrating against the Negro children who are merely victims in this "cold war" of power plays by the Federal Government; the mothers are booing the United States marshals who represent the tyranny of the Federal Courts which are acting outside of the law, invading the rights of the States, and interfering with the time-honored practice of local control of education.

When certain local officials back down in the face of these illegal, unconstitutional acts of the Federal Courts they are trading off the rights of the people and the rights of the States in order to curry favor with the new administration which is pledged to carry out the aims of the NAACP as stated in the platform of the Democratic Party.

If Federal Tyranny is not resisted in Louisiana and in every other State and on every other occasion, where will it end?

In Louisiana today there is no "consent of the governed."

(Editor's Note' Please see other articles and editorials on the Louisiana situation in this issue of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN).

IF GIVEN THE TRUE FACTS . . . .

"We believe in the American way of life . . . in our republican form of government. We have infinite faith that the American people, given the true facts of the case will, nine times out of ten, be correct in their judgment.

"The quality of your reading matter is the key to your viewpoint. Is it pro-American or is it slanted by the one-worlders, the UN fanatics, the NAACP, the NCC, the fellow travelers or any of the dozens of organizations seeking so desperately to brainwash America?"

--Bozeman (Mont.) Gallatin Co. TRIBUNE

DEFEND THE CONNALLY RESERVATION!

(Reprinted from the New York (N.Y.) DAILY NEWS)

Under the general head of American liberties, we'd like to pay our respects again to The Connally Reservation -- and our disrespects to the Senators who hope to get the new Senate to repeal it.

This is the U. S. reservation to Art. 36 of the Statute of the United Nations' International Court of Justice (World Court), in which the United States declares that it retains the right to decide what cases it will and will not submit to the UN tribunal.

Lacking this reservation, we could be haled into the World Court to defend any sort of lawsuit against us--a suit, for example, by Soviet Russia to recover Alaska, or by Fidel Castro to have us kicked off the Guantanamo naval base.

The World Court is made up of judges from 15 nations, two of them Communist; and the United States has just been foolish enough to put Philip Jessup on the World Court as U.S. judge.

We cannot safely submit to this court's unlimited jurisdication, in a world studded with nations which either hate the United States or covet its wealth or both.

Repeal the Connally Reservation, and we'd be a sitting duck for piratical countries which would bedevil us with lawsuits aimed at taking away everything of value we possess; and some of these plaintiffs might easily win those suits. Our only appeal would be to the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

So how about writing your Senators about your feelings in this matter, too?

The Old Pro Said It

Nikita Khrushchev gets too much credit for the policy of co-existence, and this leads to error in assessing the Communist purpose. It was Lenin who said, "We must practice co-existence with other nations, until we are strong enough to take over by world revolution."

The Un-Constitutional Actions of Federal Court in N.O. School Crisis

By Kent and Phoebe Courtney

It is the opinion of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN that the actions of the three Federal District Judges in New Orleans on November 30 are un-Constitutional for the following five reasons:

(1) Article 3, Section 1, of the U. S. Constitution states: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court..." Article 3, Section 2, Clause 2, states: "In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, AND THOSE IN WHICH A STATE SHALL BE PARTY, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction..."

The injunction issued by the three Federal Judges reads: "The United States of America vs. the State of Louisiana." Because this case was initiated by a Federal District Court instead of the U. S. Supreme Court, such action on the part of the Federal District Court is un-Constitutional according to Article 3, Section 2, Clause 2, of the U. S. Constitution.

(2) Article 4, Section 4, of the U. S. Constitution states: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government..."

Because the three Federal District Judges have prohibited the duly elected officials of the State of Louisiana from continuing to function in their official legislative capacities, it can be seen that the State of Louisiana has now been denied a republican form of government, and has, instead, been placed under the complete control of a Federal District Court.

(3) The May, 1954, integration ruling of the Supreme Court is not, as yet, "the law of the land." The integration decree was based in part on the sociological theories of a Swedish Socialist by the name of Myrdal, and in part on the 14th Amendment.

Section 5 of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution states: "The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

Even though all Civil Rights bills since the Supreme Court decision of 1954 have carried amendments seeking to have Congress approve "by appropriate legislation" the provisions of this Supreme Court ruling, in each case Congress has refused to approve the Supreme Court ruling. Therefore, because Congress has not approved the Supreme Court decree in accordance with Section 5 of the 14th Amendment, the integration decree is not yet "the law of the land".

Because the three Federal District Judges based their injunction suit on a Supreme Court ruling which is not yet "the law of the land" the action by the three District Judges in New Orleans is un-Constitutional.

(4) Amendment 10 of the United States Constitution states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Nowhere in the Constitution is the matter of "education" discussed. The Constitution does not give the United States the power to interfere with or control education in any way whatsoever. This right is reserved by the Constitution "to the States respectively, or to the people."

(5) One of the injunction suits by the Federal District Court was instituted by a local U. S. Attorney. All proposed Civil Rights bills in previous years have carried amendments which sought to give power to the U. S. Attorney General to institute law suits. Congress has, in every case, specifically defeated such an amendment. Therefore the U. S. Attorney General does not have the right to institute law suits. And yet, in Louisiana, on November 30, we find that a mere local U. S. Attorney has taken it upon himself to institute a suit in the name of the United States of America enjoining the duly elected officials of the Sovereign State of Louisiana. THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN believes such action is not only illegal, but could be considered to be in contempt of Congress.

John Donne, the noted English poet (1573-1631), wrote: "No man is an Island...,any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind;....And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; It tolls for thee."

If the sovereign power of the State of Louisiana can be destroyed by illegal, un-Constitutional acts of a three-man Federal District Court, the Constitutionally-guaranteed sovereignty of every single State in the Union is now in jeopardy.

'Good Old Mr. Sam,' Knife in Hand

(Reprinted from CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS)

When the Kennedy Democrats were trying to nail down the all-important Southern electoral votes--which in the showdown did indeed provide the margin for election victory--they picked Texan Lyndon Johnson to run for Vice President. The inclusion of a Texan--"a Southerner"--on the ticket was supposed to indicate "everything will be all right."

And then they pointed out that other Texas gentleman, Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn--lovingly and pointedly called "Mister Sam" in tones that exuded the sweetness of magnolia blossoms. "Mister Sam" practically controls the House of Representatives single-handedly and so if Southerners should go along then "everything will be all right."

A great many Southerners bought the phony pitch (though a majority of Tennesseans may be proud they did not).

Now comes the pay-off. And from the Southern point of view everything is not going to be all right. Nor is sweet old "Mister Sam" doing anything for the South. He is the key to what is going to be done to the South.

Rep. Rayburn has joined the Northern radical leftwingers to purge the Rules Committee and choke off the conservative voice there.

The Rules Committee is the key to House action, since it decides what bills get to the floor and when. The committee is made up of four Republicans and eight Democrats. But two of the Democrats are conservatives--Chairman Howard Smith of Virginia and Rep. William Colmer of Mississippi. When anti-South, anti-Constitution, anti-conservative bills come up, these two Democrats usually join the four Republicans to block them with a 6-6 deadlock vote.

Two avenues were considered by the leftwing Democrats to pull the conservatives' teeth. One was to increase the size of the committee by adding a couple of leftwingers. The other was to purge either Rep. Smith or Rep. Colmer, who hold their posts through Democratic seniority.

Rep. Smith was considered too strong to attack. So Rep. Colmer has become the target.

And "Mister Sam" reportedly has agreed to go along with the left-wingers and the Kennedy-Johnson Administration plan.

Southerners who gave the margin of victory to the Kennedy-Johnson ticket are about to see only the beginning of what they have inflicted upon themselves and the country.

HELP SPREAD THE WORD

Every month, in order to combat the millions of words spewed out by the left-wing press, THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN distributes thousands of free sample copies.

These sample copies are paid for by the contributions sent in by our supporters, who wish in this way, to fight against the Socialists who have infiltrated every part of our government.

If you believe in the work we are doing, and if you wish to help us spread the message of Americanism contained in THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, then please contribute to our "Distribution Fund" to help finance these free sample copies.

Just make your check out to The Independent American, 7314 Zimpel St., New Orleans, La.

DEBATE "RIGGERS" ON THE RUN

By Phoebe Courtney

It is with pleasure that I report to the subscribers of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN and to those who purchased our TAX FAX pamphlet entitled " 'Rigged' High School Debates Promote World Government" that this TAX FAX pamphlet has had the immediate effect of putting the promoters of these "rigged" debates on the whimpering defensive.

In our TAX FAX #26 exposing these "rigged" high school debates, which this year are discussing "How can the security of the free world best be maintained?" we stated: "Significantly absent from the resolutions as to how to maintain the security of the free world is a resolution which would call for an independent, strong United States free of foreign entanglements."

We then went on to state: "In the official Debate Handbook published by the Midwest Debate Bureau of Normal, Illinois, 38 pages are devoted to debate instructions. These instructions are designed to prevent the pro-national sovereignty position from being voiced." The remainder of our TAX FAX pamphlet on these "rigged" high school debates is devoted to a documented exposé of how the United Nations has failed, and how the U.N. now presents a very definite threat to the survival of the United States as a Constitutional Republic.

THUNDEROUS QUIBBLE

We are in receipt of a letter from a Mr. Bower Aly, who signs himself "Executive Secretary, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation, National University Extension Association."

Despite Mr. Aly's ponderous title, his letter is light-weight indeed. His only criticism of our documented TAX FAX pamphlet entitled " 'Rigged' High School Debates Promote World Government" is that our pamphlet states that the "Debate Handbook," published by the Mid-West Debate Bureau of Normal, Illinois, is "official." Mr. Aly says that this Debate Handbook "has no official standing whatever."

Mr. Aly's letter indicates that there is an "official" Debate Handbook other than the one we referred to. However, Mr. Aly's letter contradicts itself, because literature covering his Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation which he enclosed with his letter states that "As a clearing house, the Committee has no authority of its own but consults the wishes of the autonomous leagues in each of the states, and offers its services to all the leagues." The question immediately arises, therefore: Has Mr. Aly or his Committee the authority to declare ANY handbook as "official" or "not official"?

Webster's dictionary gives as one of the definitions for "official" the word "authoritative." I have in my hand a copy of the Mid-West Debate Bureau's Handbook, which I still maintain is an official handbook for these nationwide "rigged" high school debates promoting the United Nations and world government. I consider it a thoroughly authoritative handbook for these debates. It is based entirely on the exact same resolutions which are being used in all high schools throughout the nation regarding this subject, contains 38 pages of detailed debate instructions, and has been distributed to high schools throughout the nation. It AUTHORITATIVELY lists 20 pages of bibliography, giving as sources for debate material some of the most radical, left-wing internationalist outfits in the country. Of the numerous books, articles, magazines and organizations listed on 20 pages, more than 95% propose disarming America, the destruction of U.S. national sovereignty, and the eventual incorporation of the United States into a world government dominated by Communist Russia.

For example, here are some of the organizations listed as sources for debate material to be used in this year's high school debates:

American Federation of World Citizens, 202 Albion Place, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 345 East 46th St., New York City, N.Y. (It will be recalled that Alger Hiss was President of this organization before he was convicted and sent to jail for lying about his Communist activities).

Committee for World Development and World Disarmament, 345 E. 46th St., New York City, N. Y.

Foreign Policy Association, 345 E. 46th St., New York City, N. Y. (see November-December issue of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN for complete exposé on Communist-front associations of some of those connected with the Foreign Policy Association.)

National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, 17 E. 45th St., New York City, N. Y. (This organization has more than its share of Communist-fronters among its members).

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 114 E. 32nd St., New York City, N. Y. (This organization is shown in the "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as having been "cited as subversive and Communist." It has been declared by this committee to be the "Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian." The California Committee on Un-American Activities found, in its 1948 Report, that "the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship *** is a direct agent of the Soviet Union, engaged in traitorous activities under the orders of Stalin's consular service in the United States.")

United World Federalists, 125 Broad St., New York City, N.Y. (whose aim is the complete destruction of U.S. national sovereignty.)

And last, but not least, an organization blatantly called "World Government Sponsors," 767 U.N. Plaza, New York 17, N. Y.

The authoritative Mid-West Debate Bureau Handbook has gone to great pains to include a miniscule number of anti-U.N. authors, such as Dr. V. Orval Watts, FREEMAN Magazine, NATIONAL REVIEW, and several others -- but that's all! The overwhelming preponderance of recommended research material in this Handbook is pro-United Nations, pro-World Government, and anti-U.S. national sovereignty.

Thus it is seen that when the promoters of the United Nations and World Government are confronted with documented evidence of how destructive their plans are to the future of this nation, their only rebuttal is to quibble over which Handbook is the "official" one. This proves conclusively what THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN has always maintained, and that is: "Evil exposed is nine-tenths destroyed." Therefore, in order to break the power of the U.N. on U. S. foreign policy, the real intent of the anti-American U.N. must be exposed. A good place to start, we believe, is with the high school students this year, as they debate the subject of the United Nations. With facts in hand, any debate team which takes the pro-American, anti-U.N. position in these high school debates can win "hands down" not only for his school, but ultimately, for his country.

* * * * *

(Note: If you wish to obtain copies of TAX FAX pamphlet #26 entitled " 'RIGGED' HIGH SCHOOL DEBATES PROMOTE WORLD GOVERNMENT," which is mentioned in the above article, you may obtain same from THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans, LA. Prices: 25¢ single copy; 10 for $1.00; 20 for $2.00; 100 for $5.00. Prices are postpaid.)

FORESIGHT ON SUMMITRY?

"'Tis better to be alone than in bad company."
- George Washington

"He that lieth down with dogs will rise up with fleas."
- Benjamin Franklin

EXECUTIVE SECRECY

During the hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1951, it was disclosed that Frederick Vanderbilt Field had sought employment in the Office of Strategic Services of the U. S. Government. Field, one of the "financial angels" and prime movers of the IPR, was a self-admitted open Communist Party Member.

Sen. Ferguson mentioned, in discussing the difficulty of conducting investigations when documents were denied by the Executive Department:

". . . The question came up as to Fred Field trying to become an officer in the O.S.S. of the United States Government. When we tried to get who were his sponsors and who recommended him, and so forth, all we could get from the military authorities even was the memorandum as to the physical examination. . . . I think the time will come when public opinion in America will have something to say on this, and we should have this information before the Congress and the people." (IPR Hearings, Part 3, page 934.)

Soft-Boiled Egghead Wants Red China In U.N.

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Washington, Dec. 20 -- Adlai Stevenson, slated to become U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and a major policy-maker in the Kennedy Administration, is of the opinion that this country must cease fighting the admission of Red China to the U.N.

He has been silent on the subject in recent months, perhaps not wishing to jeopardize his chances for a post in the new administration, but his views on this and other issues are public record. They are not very reassuring.

On September 22, 1959, Stevenson appeared on a local New York television show. He told the moderator that the U.S. must not oppose the admission to the U.N. of Red China. That question should be left to other members "without interference from this country, regardless of how we vote upon that matter." Spirited opposition to recognition, Stevenson said, has brought "criticism from our own allies, and has been a mistake."

Stevenson's views on Far Eastern affairs were spelled out in considerable detail in a foreign affairs magazine a few months later. The article shocked this country's Far Eastern allies, facts which were brought to the attention of the State Department.

Specifically, Stevenson called for the admission of Communist China to the U.N. ("World peace appears an unattainable goal as long as Communist China is barred from international society"); the gift of Quemoy and Matsu to the Red Chinese; U.N.-supervised elections on Formosa (but not the mainland); and the inclusion of Japan and South Korea in a demilitarized, atom-free "neutralist" zone.

In return for these overtures, Stevenson thought that the Red Chinese would accept a peaceful border settlement with India, and cease their warlike moves against Formosa.

For these and other policy stands, the Communist press and radio the world over earnestly plugged Stevenson for the Presidency.

After the Democratic Convention, the Red press boosted Kennedy to a large extent because it was felt he would surround himself with "progressive, forward - thinking men" like Stevenson. The official Communist Hungarian-language paper in this country, Magyar Szo, endorsed Kennedy because "such liberal politicians as Stevenson and President Roosevelt's widow belong to the Democratic Party and may exert influence upon the policy of a Democratic President."

Cheering to the Communists was a speech delivered by Stevenson last May at the Conference on World Tensions in Chicago in which he ripped the administration for not "waging peace." Stevenson denied the Communists are "plotting world revolution," declared that we could deal with Khrushchev because he is a "realistic politician."

A month later came the Paris Summit, in which Mr. K, always the "realistic politician," proved how eager he was to meet with the U.S.

A key sentence from that Stevenson speech declared:

"Meanwhile they (the Russians) stopped testing unilaterally; they reduced their army unilaterally; they proposed total disarmament before the world forum of the United Nations. Whatever the motive, cynical or sincere, they have constantly taken the initiative. They have answered the cry for peace, while we have quibbled and hesitated and finally given in. Too often our approach has been 'yes, but,' instead of 'why not?' Too often our uncertainty and quibbling has left the impression that the United States is looking for reasons not to reach an agreement."

Earlier this year Stevenson told a French newsman that he favored a reduction of the American garrison in Berlin, some sort of "disengagement" from Europe under the lines of the Communist Rapacki Plan, and a repudiation of German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. Although Stevenson maintained that he had been "misquoted" (as he has on other occasions) the Adenauer government circulated a top-secret memorandum during the campaign opposing the Kennedy candidacy, primarily because of Stevenson's influence in his Administration.

(Copyright, 1960, King Features Syndicate, Inc.)

UN Voting and Paying

(Reprinted from the CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS)

With the UN increasing in membership, in activity and in spending, the American people should not be unaware of its composition and financing.

Currently there are 99 UN member nations. Thus 50 of them -- and there are that many which are small and minor states, some with little more than a paper or theoretical existence and little national or international responsibility -- can carry a majority vote.

This body of minor nations which could exercise the majority voice, pays less than 7 per cent of the UN costs while casting 50 votes, as compared with the United States position of paying about 33 per cent of the cost of the UN while casting but one vote.

It should be remembered, too, that the 99 members include Communist Albania, Communist Bulgaria, Communist Byelorussia (which is really a state of the USSR), Communist Cuba, Communist Czechoslovakia, Communist Hungary, Communist Poland, Communist Romania, Communist Ukraine (another USSR state), Communist USSR itself and Communist Yugoslavia.

In addition, there are such pro-Communist members as Ghana, Guinea and United Arab Republic. Then there are many so-called neutralists, like India and Indonesia, which are often pro-Communist.

UN members are glad for the United States to carry the burden -- and for such nations as the Congo, Cuba, Ghana and the like to have an equal vote, while Russia in effect has three votes in addition to those of its completely controlled satellites.

Dangerous Choice For World Court

(Reprinted from the Manchester (N.H.) UNION-LEADER)

In recent weeks, Dr. Philip C. Jessup has been appointed to represent the United States on the World Court at The Hague. This is the same Philip Jessup who associated with at least four Red Front organizations; who was a leading member and advisor of the Institute of Pacific Relations, a Communist propaganda organization; who edited the notorious White Paper on China; who favors recognition of Red China; who served as a character witness for Alger Hiss at both trials in which Hiss was charged with turning over secret documents to the Kremlin.

This man, who was rejected by a Senate Subcommittee in 1951 as unfit for appointment as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, an appointment which the Senate later refused to vote upon, is to be United States representative on the World Court! While left-wing efforts continue to scrap the Connally Reservation, your country is to be represented by a man whom 55 House members and 38 Senators in 1951 said should never hold ANY diplomatic status!

IF THE EVENTS OF THE PAST FEW WEEKS DO NOT WAKE UP THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO THE DANGERS FACING THEIR COUNTRY PROBABLY NOTHING EVER WILL.

We have heard "liberals" say: "Don't call that man a communist! You haven't any proof that he is a party member." When we hear that we are reminded of the old saying: "If it looks like a rabbit, hops like a rabbit, and acts like a rabbit, I'm going to call it a rabbit."

DOPE - COMMUNIST CHINA'S SECRET WEAPON

By Lawrence Sullivan

Coordinator of Information, U. S. House of Representatives

Red China in the U. N. ?

Communist China, the world's biggest dope peddler today, has launched a new world-wide drive for admission into the United Nations.

She needs this new badge of prestige badly if she is to protect and expand her billion-dollar-a-year traffic in narcotics.

For the first time in human history, the systematic production and distribution of narcotic drugs has become an organized government monopoly in Red China. In 10 years, Mao Tse-tung has built up a virtual world monopoly in opium, heroin and morphine.

Membership in the UN would give the Chinese Communists lawful and open access, through pro forma trade missions, to every major city in the U.S.A., Latin America and Western Europe. At present, all these dope outlets are maintained through illicit underground connections, at great cost to the narcotics trust in Peiping.

Details of the flourishing Chinese drug traffic came to light in a recent report from the United Nations commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Harry J. Anslinger, chief of the Narcotics Bureau, U.S. Treasury Department, was the U.S. delegate to the special U.N. conference on the rapidly expanding narcotics trade.

Anslinger named Fang Jung Ho as China's Chief of Special Trade. He is the Cabinet Officer in charge of dope operations the world around.

"Spreading narcotic addiction and obtaining funds for political purposes through the sale of heroin and opium is not just the policy of one man in the Communist regime. It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China," Anslinger told the UN Commission. "There is a close relation with the People's Bank of China, both of which have local branches throughout the country, with special counters to handle loans, credits and mortgages for opium. The transportation of opium shipments is guarded by the armed forces."

Incoming shipments of raw opium from the countryside are analyzed and graded by the Shanghai Hygienic Department, just as eggs are candled and graded in New York or Chicago before shipment.

When an international narcotics contract is signed, through the Red China tobacco monopoly, the papers are turned over to the regional army commander. The army arranges the landing at the specified foreign port.

Narcotics experts attached to the Commission estimate that more than five million acres of land in starving China are now devoted exclusively to intensive cultivation of narcotic poppies.

Everyone connected with the Communist dope traffic is charged with the daily responsibility and duty of recruiting new addicts to "chase the dragon," as the habit is described throughout the Orient.

Anslinger documented for the UN Commission the case of a young Japanese seaman, Saito, who signed on one of the ships in the Chinese dope fleet from Yokohama.

During his first voyage Saito, who was not an addict, was tied hand and feet and forcibly given heroin injections until he manifest a craving for the drug. He became a confirmed addict.

Youngsters thus forced to "chase the dragon" become ready servants of the Chinese dope mobsters, eager for any criminal assignment of violence which will assure their daily narcotic requirements. By this technique, Communist China has built up a ready army of fiendish criminals in all the principal port cities of the world.

Despite intensified police work throughout the United States, new addicts are cultivated daily in every major city, chiefly because Communist sources send in a constant dope supply for their "pushers."

"All the documents examined by the United Nations coming from all governments in that area point to the fact that Communist China is the major source of supply of narcotics for the entire world," Anslinger reported. (Page 202)

New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., Illinois, and all of California were cited by Anslinger as the principal retail dope markets in the U.S.

"In California, after months of intensive investigation, which took a lot of money and very dangerous undercover work, we came up with a group of Chinese who had been smuggling from Communist China. They had a direct connection with Hong Kong. A fellow in Hong Kong by the name of Judah Isaac Ezra, whom we had sent to the penitentiary years ago, had the connections inside China, and was taking care of most of the traffic into the United States." (Page 182)

"For several years I have presented documented facts which establish that narcotic trafficking from the Chinese mainland is an insidious, calculated scheme of the Chinese Communist regime to obtain operating funds and at the same time spread the debauchery of narcotic addiction among the free nations," Anslinger's report to the UN continued.

"In most instances the heroin was brought into the country concealed on the persons of seamen. Ornately carved camphorwood chests with specially built compartments were also used for the smuggling operations."

Opium poppies are bid in by the Bank of China at $72 per pound, American, and refined heroin at $500 per pound.

"In Kwangtung Province the opium poppy planting is about three times what it was in 1951. . . . The yield must be sold to the Communist cooperatives."

In one recent year, Los Angeles accounted for 7,000 narcotics arrests, out of a total of 24,000 for the entire U. S.

New York City now has increased its police Narcotics Squad to 200 men.

"The teen-age problem is still with us," Anslinger told the House Appropriations Committee, "but that is spotty. It certainly is not general. You will not find it, say, through the South, or even in Pittsburgh, and there are very few teen-age cases in Philadelphia. The real teen-age problem is in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles. . . . In relation to schools, the only problem we have is in New York City. . . . The City and State of New York jointly set up a special hospital for adolescent drug addicts. They have had a daily population roughly between 60 and 100 patients."

The narcotics traffic serves international communism in two very practical ways. It provides tremendous dollar and sterling exchange pools all around the world; secondly, the traffic is a fiendish weapon of sabotage against the free world, for every new addict impairs and undermines in some degree the total productive power of the victim nation.

Should the United Nations vote to admit the world's foremost dope mobster?

(Reprinted from CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS)

Worthwhile Proposal

(Reprinted from the Indianapolis (Ind.) STAR)

When Congress convenes early in January, one of its first orders of business should be to pass HR 12852. This bill originally introduced by Representative Francis Walter (D-Pa.) on June 28, is designed to cope with Communist infiltration into the vital area of radio communications. Specifically, it would prohibit the issuance of radio operators' licenses to Communists or those who refuse to answer questions relating to Communist activities, and it would allow the revocation of a previously issued license to any such individual.

One of America's first lines of defense is its Conelrad system, designed to protect against interference with the operation of United States defensive and offensive missiles during an enemy attack. In the event of such an attack, 1,300 radio stations in the U.S. will immediately either shut down or switch to frequencies of 640 or 1240 kilocycles. This will prevent radiation from any transmitters providing a navigational aid (a homing signal) to enemy aircraft, and will prevent an operator of a transmitter from giving intelligence information to the enemy, or subversive information to the listening public.

The danger of subversives in strategic positions cannot be overestimated. Testifying recently before a congressional committee, Michael Mignon, a representative of the AFL-CIO Communications Workers of America, himself an ex-Communist, said: "I have no doubt in my mind that any member of the Communist Party, in the event of war or an attack on the United States, would do all possible to aid the enemy of our country." Furthermore, he said, "there is no room for a member of the Communist Party in the communications industry." Yet, six witnesses who appeared before the committee (all of whom have radio operators' licenses—including an NBC studio engineer) refused to answer questions about their Communist associations, preferring to duck behind the Fifth Amendment.

Among the experts who supported Representative Walter's resolution were a vice-president of the American Cable and Radio Corporation, who said the possibility of sabotage in the communications area was "the greatest danger to national defense," and Mutual Broadcasting System Vice-President Joseph F. Keating, who said it required only a few Communist agents or sympathizers—placed in vital areas—to play havoc with the Conelrad system.

Less than a year ago, Representative William M. Tuck (D-Va.) revealed that "the North Atlantic cable—which, day by day, carries important top-secret information to and from the Pentagon—is being serviced right now by the American Communications Association, a Communist-dominated union which was thrown out of the CIO in 1950 because of its communistic control." Yet nothing has been done to remedy that condition.

In the event some of our legislators are not yet aware of it—and it would appear they are not—the Communists are playing for keeps in their unrelenting cold war. And their Red tentacles reach into every important area of American life, including the penetration of radio facilities. Allowing them to infiltrate our security system, and remain there despite foreknowledge of their aims, amounts to little more than playing Russian roulette on a national scale.

If the new administration is determined to win the cold war for the United States, it can begin immediately after taking office. And the best way would be for it to support HR 12852, which would help eliminate a clear and present danger.

RIGHT WING EDITORIALS WANTED

Patriots, please send us right-wing, patriotic editorials which may appear in your local newspapers. However, please do not mark on them with pencil or crayon, as all newspaper editorials are reproduced in THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN by a photographic process.

'Right To Work' Wins In Many States--But Not With Kennedy

A MEASURE as to what the people want in the matter of laws permitting men and women to work at any task they may choose without a force-by-law regulation compelling them to belong to any organization, is found in the results of the recent election.

President-Elect Kennedy is publicly pledged to repeal the present laws adopted by the states that give the working people a right to decide individually about any affiliation that confronts them.

The incoming President would abolish the protective laws, including Florida's law, and thus compel any and all workers to join a union, whether they wished to, or not.

As a bulwark in the field of American freedom for the worker, the new President will find Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia spearheading a bloc in Congress that will try to block any such attempt to change our laws.

REPORTS are in now from the National Right to Work Committee, covering the election, and "showing how strong support for voluntary unionism was reflected by a number of important election gains among candidates pledged to this principle." The committee reports, in part:

"A significant example is found in Marion County, Ind., which includes the state's largest city, Indianapolis. Union professionals made Right to Work a major issue in the reelection effort of 12 state representatives who had supported compulsory unionism. The anti-Right to Work campaign used every device from state fair exhibits to TV advertising.

"When the votes were tallied, the 12 incumbent representatives had been replaced by 12 Republicans publicly pledged to retention of the state Right to Work law. The five state senators who supported Right to Work in the 1957 and 1959 sessions were returned to office."

The 79-21 Democratic majority in the House, which in 1959 had passed a Right to Work repealer, was replaced by a 66-34 Republican majority supporting voluntary unionism.

Opponents of Right to Work will control the Indiana Senate, but the functioning head of the Senate will be Lt. Gov. Richard Ristine, a vigorous supporter of Right to Work. The Republicans gained five Congressmen, but lost the governorship race by a narrow margin.

In other fields the reports show:

Utah—Right to Work was a major issue and Gov. George D. Clyde, who supports voluntary unionism, gave his opposition a sound beating.

Kansas—Right to Work gained more than 15 state legislative seats.

New Mexico—Newly-elected governor Edwin Mecham, former state legislator who sponsored a Right to Work bill in that body, won over the Democratic incumbent who was pledged to compulsory unionism.

Delaware — Here, voters elected a governor opposed to Right to Work while retaining a legislative majority free from labor lobbyists.

Vermont—Russell Wigsette, supporter of compulsory unionism was beaten and Right to Work supporters gained in the legislature.

Oklahoma—Several Right to Work supporters were added to the state legislature.

But the White House won't listen.

JIM ROSEMOND

(Reprinted from the Ft. Lauderdale (Fla.) NEWS)

(....From Page 1)

GOLDWATER - -

ary schools whose curricula meet standards established by a special national board of professors—instructors in academic subjects, not professors of education. This would be intended to solve the longtime conservative dilemma of how, short of imposing Federal control, to force high schools to drop "progressive" education theories and return to classical disciplines.

MINIMUM WAGE: Sen. Goldwater currently opposes proposals for a boost of the $1-an-hour minimum wage to $1.25 and extension of coverage to the now-exempted retail and service trades. For the future, he is considering pegging an increase in the minimum to productivity and the cost of living. There is an outside chance he might go along with dropping present exemptions from minimum wage coverage if coverage were withheld from workers whose wages are governed by union-negotiated contracts. This would emphasize protection for The Forgotten American, in this case the non-union worker.

MEDICAL CARE: Sen. Goldwater currently opposes any Federal medical help for the aged. For the future, he is considering a plan of massive tax reductions for private organizations providing cut-rate assistance for the aged.

DEPRESSED AREAS: Sen. Goldwater currently opposes any Federal help for regions of chronically high unemployment. Without embracing liberal plans for heavy Federal spending to revive the areas, he may in the future advocate outlays by Uncle Sam for retraining workers and subsidising migration from heavy unemployment spots. Other possibilities: Additional unemployment compensation benefits, conditional upon applying for job retraining; and some plan of helping depressed areas by tariff protection.

Moreover, substantial shifts of position by Mr. Goldwater are implied in the manifesto itself. Consider foreign aid, a favorite whipping boy for conservatives. Rather than resume the attack, the manifesto actually endorses aid for friends and allies and handouts for other nations "if it is clearly demonstrated that granting it in actuality strengthens American security."

Or look at the treatment of Social Security. Instead of decrying Government old-age insurance as the cornerstone of the welfare state, the new doctrine merely utters the hope that some day "Social Security will become only a minor and supplemental source of . . . support (for retired persons), the bulk of which will come from private plans established through private initiative and voluntary participation."

A Change in Labor Policy

The change in tone from past Goldwater doctrine is most subtle in labor policy, considered the Senator's specialty. Mr. Goldwater gained his early national reputation by constant denunciations of compulsory unionism and union political action. Yet the manifesto condemns neither as such; it instead implies that they must not coexist. If union membership is compulsory, it argues, the union member's dues should not be used for political purposes.

Indeed, there is a general shift in the Goldwater manifesto away from Federal restriction of union power to Federal protection of rank-and-file unionists, which is not quite the same thing. The tone seems unmistakably altered when the manifesto calls for Federal action aimed at preventing unions from excluding anyone, including Negroes, from membership; Government-supervised strike votes if requested by 30% of a union's membership, and Federal help for union members seeking court relief against union abuses under the Landrum-Griffin labor reform act's "Bill of Rights."

• • • • •

(Editor's note: Compromise is an erosive force. Now that Goldwater has backed down from the Conservative position advocated in his book "The Conscience of a Conservative", where will he draw the line at compromising? Will he draw the line? Or will he gradually, compromise by compromise, drift to the middle-of-the-road philosophy and then finally into left field as the presidential election of 1964 approaches? During the 1960 campaign, Goldwater stated that he and Nelson Rockefeller were in agreement in many areas. It now becomes apparent what he meant!)

More Aid For Tito

(from the Manchester (N.H.) UNION-LEADER)

It would appear that all Communist Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito needs to do to gain American aid is to kick Uncle Sam in the teeth.

No sooner had Tito accused the United States of being the principal source of discord in the world and announced his alignment to Moscow in a speech before the Yugoslav Parliament than the State Department was announcing plans for a $100,000,000 program designed to aid Yugoslavia's economy.

The rationalization for the proposal is that it will help bring about a trade and currency reform which will tie Tito economically closer to the West.

On the basis of the record of our dealings with Tito it would appear safe to assume that our capacity for self-deception knows no bounds. There is not a single issue worth mentioning on which Tito sees eye-to-eye with the Free World. He has viciously attacked our position in The Congo and demanded that the deposed leftist premier, Patrice Lumumba, be restored to power. More recently, he has attacked the Free World's position in Laos, charging that "reactionary forces" have gained "open military support from Thailand and some other Western countries" and warning that we are "kindling the fires of war."

Yet, this bum, who orders unarmed American planes shot down and American civilians imprisoned on trumped up charges, nevertheless is being coddled and fawned over by Washington.

We use the term "bum" not because we delight in name-calling, but rather because we prefer to describe Tito accurately. Tito, one of the world's foremost prosecutors of religion, believes that anyone who teaches religion is an "enemy of the people." He was the first of the Communist satellite dictators to imprison a ranking ecclesiastic. The heroic martyrdom of Aloisius Cardinal Stepinac of Zagreb will never be forgotten by those who love freedom.

The AFL-CIO convention in 1955 accurately described Tito as one of the "reprehensible foes of human dignity, decency, and liberty."

Nor has Tito disguised his loyalty to the Kremlin. He has never revoked or modified his pledge, at Stalingrad, that **"Yugoslavia in time of peace as in time of war will march shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union."**

Of the Soviet massacre of Hungarian Freedom Fighters, Tito said: **"It is understood that if the latter saves socialism in Hungary, then, comrades, we will be able to say, although we are against the intervention, that Soviet intervention was necessary."**

The last we heard the American people were being asked to contribute millions—nay, billions—in taxes to "fight communism" and "raise American prestige abroad." **But as a very practical matter, much of this money is being spent to support Communist dictators in Yugoslavia and Poland.**

AND THIS SHAMEFUL PRACTICE WILL CONTINUE JUST SO LONG AS WE, THE PEOPLE, PERMIT IT TO CONTINUE.

Eternal Truths

Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.

—George Washington

• • • •

The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

—Woodrow Wilson

The Myth They Won't Let Die

(Reprinted from the WALL STREET JOURNAL)

All one has to do is to add 2 and 2 to see how untrue the myth is that the nation's schools are falling apart and can only be saved by the vast power and money in Washington.

This newspaper has long known it for a political myth. Hardly a week goes by that local units of government--whether state, city, county or school district--do not announce the successful sale or the offering of bond issues for schools. The total for the nation runs into hundreds of millions of dollars a year, all raised by taxes voted by the public on themselves. Here and there a place has fallen a bit behind the average--but, as everyone knows, in order to reach an average, some must be above and some below.

It was the "average" Federal aiders pointed to with dismay a decade ago. And it was the average that, 10 years ago, led the nation's communities to embark on the greatest school building program any like period in America has yet seen.

Well, then, what is the average today? The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has dug into figures of the Federal Office of Education, and the results should astonish the politicians, if they would only look. The figures show that current class room "shortages" are the lowest in the past quarter century. Half the classrooms now in use have been built since World War II. Government surveys, the Chamber reports, indicate that less than 1% of the nation's school districts have used up their resources, or reached their legal borrowing limits.

Whereas the public was told that only Washington could do the job of meeting the growing school populations, the communities not only met the so-called "crisis" but went far beyond it. From 1950 through 1959 pupil enrollments increased by 10.2 million--but enough schoolrooms were built to take care of 16.8 million youngsters. Not only that; the school districts also employed enough new teachers so that the average number of pupils per teacher dropped from 26 to 25--though the public was led to believe that teachers were leaving the school systems in droves.

None of this is meant to argue that there is still not room for improvement. But it is meant to argue that there is no need now and that there never was a need for Uncle Sam to take over the nation's schools.

If the nation's people wanted Washington to build the schools, why then did the people themselves build so well to prevent it?

Resume Tests

(Reprinted from the MANCHESTER (N.H.) UNION LEADER)

When even Sen. Hubert Humphrey starts complaining about our self-imposed moratorium on nuclear tests, then its time for President Eisenhower to call a halt to his dangerous wishful thinking on the subject. Senator Humphrey, after all, has never been known to take too strong a stand in favor of military preparedness. Disarmament has been his major concern in recent years.

Lending urgency to Senator Humphrey's statement that nuclear weapons tests should be resumed if an agreement is not worked out by mid-1961 (Humphrey is usually about six-months behind the rest of his colleagues in his understanding of Soviet intentions) is Atomic Energy Chairman John McCone's surmisal that Soviet Russia is violating the ban secretly by carrying on underground nuclear weapons tests. McCone has urged that the United States resume tests if a control agreement is not reached quickly.

It will forever be a monument to American gullibility that we have refrained from conducting nuclear tests for two years while the Kremlin made a farce of the Geneva negotiations. Washington's capacity for self-deception seems to be limitless, so much so that this newspaper almost feels obliged to challenge Mr. Mc Cone's remark that "we cannot go on with this indefinitely."

Indeed! Who would have believed in 1952, when the President and others were promising to "roll back the Iron Curtain," that we would voluntarily halt progress on nuclear weapons tests and rely on the "good faith" of the Masters of Deceit?

QUOTE !

For anyone still waiting for authoritative word on the radical leftism of this year's Democratic platform, it has now arrived. Quote -- "Our Democratic friends are too Utopian. They promise too much to everyone too easily."

Who says so? None other than Norman Thomas, dean of American Socialists!

Of Jefferson and Jackson?

(Reprinted from CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS)

Throughout the recent political campaign, Americans heard the Democratic Party spoken of frequently as "the party of Jefferson and Jackson." Historically, that is true. But is it still the party of Jefferson and Jackson in constitutional philosophy?

When Thomas Jefferson was inaugurated as the third President of the United States he declared:

"About to enter, fellow-citizens, upon the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently, those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people, a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace, and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts, and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information, and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason; freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of person, under the protection of the habeas corpus, the trial by juries impartially selected.

As Andrew Jackson ended his second term as President, he asserted in his farewell address:

"It is well known that there have always been those among us, who wish to enlarge the powers of the General Government; and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to over-step the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created; and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them. Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances, shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the General Government will, before long, absorb all the powers of Legislation, and you will have, in effect, but one Consolidated Government. From the extent of our country, its diversified interests, different pursuits, and different habits, it is too obvious for argument, that a single Consolidated Government would be wholly inadequate to watch over and protect its interests; and every friend of our free institutions should be always prepared to maintain unimpaired, and in full vigor, the rights and Sovereignty of the States, and to confine the action of the General Government strictly to the sphere of its appropriate duties."

The platform on which President-elect John Kennedy ran is as far from these statements by Jefferson and Jackson as one pole from the other. Mr. Kennedy could achieve true presidential greatness by strict adherence to the Constitution and to these statements by Jefferson and Jackson. But his inaugural address will sound little like these statements. It is the style these days to hail the names of Jefferson and Jackson and ignore their principles.

Colony of U.N.?

"International government, under the United Nations and its multilateral treaties, is totalitarian...The ultimate fact that must be recognized is that the possession of sovereignty in the people (as in the United States) is the only thing that distinguishes a state or nation from a province, colony, municipality or dependency of a state or nation.

"If the sovereignty of the United States or people thereof is forfeited and relinquished through treaty or voluntary acquiescence in one way or another, the United States becomes then in effect a province or dependency of the United Nations. In the ultimate, if the people of the United States are no longer sovereign in fact, and they can no longer control or exercise sovereign rights, then they have obviously gone back to where they were before the War of the Revolution when their sovereignty was fully exercised by Great Britain, and the enactment of law and taxation without representation was a reality.

"The question restated is this: Are we to become provinces or colonies again, this time under the aegis of world government, or are we to remain free and independent, with sovereignty remaining in the people of this country and government existing under a delegation and limitation of powers?"

--Judge Joseph L. Call of the Superior Court of California in CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS

DEPRESSED AREAS

BY DAN SMOOT

(Reprinted from THE DAN SMOOT REPORT)

DAN SMOOT

Important sections of America are suffering economic depression. Key industries have died, or have moved to other sections, or migrated to foreign countries -- leaving unemployment and bread lines.

In every case, programs of the federal government are primarily responsible.

Foreign aid, which built the industrial and economic power of foreign nations at the expense of Americans, placed such burdens on Americans that the cost of doing business in the United States skyrocketed. Foreigners, using the production facilities and skills which our government had given them, began to compete with Americans in all the markets of the world, including the domestic American market -- and began to capture those markets.

American industries, unable to compete with foreign products, started closing their American factories and moving abroad. The federal government encouraged this trend by giving special tax privileges to American firms going overseas.

The foreign trade policies of the federal government also helped foreigners and handicapped Americans. Foreigners, whose industries had been built with American tax money, kept up a high wall of tariffs to protect their domestic markets against American goods; but our government, under the "reciprocal trade" program opened the doors for foreign goods to enter and capture the American market.

The government's agricultural programs are another reason for "depressed areas." After buying and storing agricultural products to keep prices so high that the products cannot be sold, our government tries to "solve" the surplus problem by giving the products away abroad -- where they become raw materials for foreign factories, costing foreigners less than they cost American factories.

Federal "labor laws" have given big unions a monopoly power enabling them to force industry-wide wage rises and cumbersome fringe benefits which have no relationship to productivity, and enabling them to institute feather-bedding, pay-roll padding practices which actually reduce productivity. This has created payroll costs in American industry that range upward of ten times the payroll costs of rival foreign industries.

Consequently, basic American commodities like coal can be undersold in America by foreign producers. Ceramics plants and pottery factories in West Virginia have gone bankrupt because of foreign competition. Carpet-making factories and textile mills in New England have either gone bankrupt or have moved to southern states where right-to-work laws give workers and employers some protection against union bosses.

The heavy burden of taxes which American industry and American workers must carry for the government's welfare programs at home add greatly to the cost of American products.

On top of all this is another tremendous burden to American industry; the cost of clerical work necessary to maintain records and make reports which a multitude of governmental agencies require in their supervision of the appalling welter of governmental programs. For example: forty years ago, only one American worker in 40 was engaged in "paper" work for American business. Now, one worker out of every six does paper work.

By 1958, conditions had become so bad that politicians (whose programs had caused the conditions) grew shrill in demanding that something be done; but not one of them ever suggested stopping the programs doing the damage. They suggested that we accelerate the harmful programs, and that we compensate "depressed" areas by giving them handouts from the federal treasury.

This remarkable program of stabbing American citizens and then giving them federal money to heal their wounds is called "Area Re-development."

(Note: THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by Dan Smoot, P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas. Subscription rates: $10.00 per year; $3.00 for 3 months.)

Dimitrov's Prophecy

It is not a very easy thing to admit, but as a very practical matter we have the feeling that the "liberals," the professional anti-anti-Communists and others of like mind have convinced the majority of the American people that there is no danger to this nation from Communist infiltration. Preying on the unfamiliarity of most people with the nature and tactics of the Communist conspiracy, they have been successful in creating an atmosphere in which communism thrives.

Perhaps Georgi Dimitrov was more prophetic than he knew when he told the Lenin School of Political Warfare during the early stages of the Red Tide:

"As Soviet power grows, there will be greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists.

"A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general is worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

Don't Stop There!

Sen. George Smathers (Dem., Fla.) says the State Department should be "swept clean from top to bottom" to oust officials who used bad judgment concerning the rise of the Red Castro regime. Fine! But don't stop there. Let's sweep clean from top to bottom all the way back to get those who may remain from the time of bad judgment that helped turn China and North Korea over to the Reds. Let's have a real clean sweep.

The Soviet Achilles Heel

A skilful and practiced fighter constantly watches his opponent for signs of a weak spot. When a flicker of pain or distress gives indication that a weak spot has been found, he goes immediately and relentlessly to work on that spot. This is what the United States should do in dealing with the Communist conspiracy.

A weak spot *has* been found. It has been indicated by pained and anguished reactions in the Kremlin whenever the spot is touched.

This weak spot is the fact that the Communist empire is built of captive nations.

The Communist empire is held together not by bonds of common interest or common goal, but simply by force. This is true even within the Soviet Union, which embraces many nations and peoples who do not willingly submit to Moscow rule and would break away from it if they knew how. Besides these, there is the ring of captive nations outside the Soviet Union.

Red rule in the whole vast empire is imposed by the leaders of a party which actually represents only a tiny fraction of the people. The genuine dedicated Communists are few. Thus they must rely on force—and on the weakness, the lack of organization and the lack of the fierceness of revolt among the subject peoples.

The incipient restiveness, the resentment and the potential rebellion of the captive peoples make a force with which the Kremlin must always reckon. Consequently the Kremlin rulers were angered—and perhaps frightened—by the Captive Nations Week affair which had a number of effects. It drew attention to the fact of the captivity of these peoples. It encouraged the exiles who fight for the liberation of their homelands. And to the subject peoples themselves, those who heard about it, the observance was a reminder of captivity and a stimulant to the hope of freedom.

Now it has been proposed by Representative Daniel Flood of Pennsylvania that a special House committee be set up in Congress to study the situation of the captive nations, and to study the ways in which the United States might help them to regain their freedom.

This is a constructive idea.

If there is to be a strategy for victory in the cold war, one of the things that must be done is to begin waging the cold war on the Reds' own territory. As long as the Communists can concentrate their attention on the subversion of the free nations and the uncommitted ones, they have the advantage of initiative. If they can be forced to defend themselves against their own internal disruptive forces, this will be a step toward gaining the initiative for the free world.

(Reprinted from the Indianapolis (Ind.) STAR)

U.S. Must Not Let Foreign Aid Be Controlled by U.N.

By THURMAN SENSING

Executive Vice President, Southern States Industrial Council

With the coming of a new administration, the country will face new decisions regarding its involvement with the United Nations.

In particular, Congress will be under heavy pressure to channel U.S. foreign aid through U.N. agencies. This action was sought last year in the Food for Peace Bill (S.1711) introduced by Sen. Hubert Humphrey, D-Minn., and co-sponsored by nine Democratic "liberals." One of those "liberals" was the then Sen. John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

It is to be hoped that the next President will have second thoughts regarding this most unwise action which he supported while in the Senate. Certainly, it is bad enough to engage in foreign giveaways. But far worse is the plan to have these giveaways controlled by U.N. officials, many of them from Iron Curtain countries. It would amount to letting Communists help decide how the funds of United States taxpayers will be spent. And, of course, the U.N. officials from Red countries would have only one purpose in spending funds supplied by the U.S. — the purpose of advancing the interests of the Soviet Union.

SELLING JOB

The do-gooders who push the U.N. cause in the United States have done an effective selling job. They have been able to convince large numbers of Americans that the United Nations is a truly impartial humanitarian organization. It is no such thing.

Let's look at the record! It shows that many of the key officials of the U.N., hired or appointed by the secretary general, are from Red bloc countries. All are paid from U.N. funds, of which the United States pays a third.

In Dag Hammarskjold's immediate entourage, his principal personal aide is Michael Potrubatch of Russia. In the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, the chief executive is Gregory P. Arkadyev of the USSR. The senior political affairs officer of the U.N. is Vladimir Jelinek of Czechoslovakia, a Russian satellite country. The Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories has as its under-secretary one Draggoslav Protitch of Yugoslavia. That country regularly votes with the Soviet Union on international issues. The chief of the Trusteeships Agreements Section is Fedor Popov of Russia. Acting chief of the Office for Europe, Middle East and Africa is another Yugoslav. The placement officer of the Fellowship Placement Office is from communist Poland. There are many, many other Iron Curtain nationals who control vital parts of the U.N. apparatus.

BUNCHE RECORD

Nor is the United States representation in the U.N. secretariat what one would want. Ralph Bunche, who received an enormous political build-up in the U.S., has a long history of association with leftist groups. Bunche was an organizer of the National Negro Congress, a group which fell under Communist control. He was an editor of a Marxist magazine. In that period, he declared that "white and Negro workers must . . . . lock arms and march shoulder to shoulder in the struggle for the liberation of the oppressed working masses." This is the man who represents the U.S.A. in the U.N. secretariat.

It would be tragic if the next President, with the approval of Congress, entrusted the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars furnished by U.S. citizens to an agency heavily infiltrated by Communist representatives. These officials hope to enslave the very nations they profess a desire to help.

During the next administration and in all the years to come, the United States must depend on its own efforts and agencies to promote its security. It must never place its trust in an edifice such as the U.N. where Communists and neutralists are masters of the house.

EXTRA COPIES

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN Newspaper

Available!

ORDER TODAY bulk copies of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN and distribute to your friends, business acquaintances, club members, and employees, etc.

GOING TO A MEETING SOON? Order your extra copies of THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN to distribute there.

5 Copies	$1.00
10 Copies	$2.00
25 Copies	$5.00
50 Copies	$10.00
100 Copies	$15.00

Order Today

These will be shipped to you IN BULK, POSTAGE PREPAID, ready for you to address, mail or distribute.

Please make your check payable to:

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

7314 Zimpel Street

New Orleans 18, Louisiana

(....From Page 1)

ROCKEFELLER CONTROLS FOREIGN POLICY

feller Foundation, and The Ford Foundation, joined by some others, have commonly cross-financed to the tune of many millions, various intermediate and agency organizations concerned with internationalism, among them the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Council on Foreign Relations, and others." The most notorious of these intermediate organizations is, of course, the Institute of Pacific Relations, of which Dean Rusk, Kennedy's Secretary of State, was a member.

THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

In 1952, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee stated: "The Institute of Pacific Relations was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American Far Eastern policies toward Communist objectives. . . .Members of the small corps of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist. . . .The IPR has been considered by the American Communist party and Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence. . . .It was the continued practice of the Institute of Pacific Relations to place in government positions both persons associated with IPR and other persons selected by the effective leadership of IPR. . . . A chief function of the IPR has been to influence United States public opinion. . . .The net result of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States." Unquote Report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on The Institute of Pacific Relations.

The Institute of Pacific Relations is supported by donations from American industrialists, corporations and foundations. According to the McCarran Committee, the foundations should have known as early as the 1930's that the IPR had ceased to be a proper or even safe recipient of foundation funds. And yet as late as December 31, 1952, the Rockefeller Foundation, with the approval of Mr. Dean Rusk, donated $50,000 to IPR.

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Council on Foreign Relations is supported by both the Carnegie Endowment and the Rockefeller Foundation. The Reece Committee hearings pointed out that "the Council on Foreign Relations came to be, in essence, an agency of the United States Government, no doubt carrying its internationalist bias with it." So dominant has become the influence of the Council on Foreign Relations, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, that it has almost taken over the prescribed activities of the U. S. State Department. Many of the studies on crucial issues made by Rockefeller's experts on the Council of Foreign Relations have been taken over by the State Department itself, at which time the State Department even went so far as to engage the secretaries serving with the Council on Foreign Relations.

In 1946, the Rockefeller Foundation, through the Council on Foreign Relations, allocated $139,000 to finance what the Reece Committee termed "the historical blackout." This project called for a re-writing of the history of American participation in World War II so that the policies and measures taken by Franklin D. Roosevelt during the war would escape critical analysis and evaluation in the future. The Reese Committee asks the question: "Do foundations have the right, using public funds, to support measures calculated to hide historical facts from the public and to perpetuate those contortions of history which war propaganda imposes on us?"

Of the above-named members of the Kennedy cabinet, the following are members of the Council on Foreign Relations, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation: CHESTER BOWLES, Under Secretary of State; DOUGLAS DILLON, Secretary of the Treasury; ROSWELL GILPATRIC, Deputy Secretary of Defense; JOHN J. McCLOY, Director of U. S. Disarmament Commission.

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND

In addition to using the vast sums of tax-free money at its disposal to promote world internationalism, the 1959 report of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, among other things, called for recognition of Red China as soon as American opinion is softened up sufficiently to accept such a disastrous action, and also to increase substantially the fantastic giveaway of U. S. taxpayer dollars abroad in Foreign Aid.

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Perhaps the best summation of the general aim of the foundations is contained in the 1934 Yearbook of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which states that the Carnegie Endowment Fund "is becoming an unofficial instrument of international policy, taking up here and there the ends and threads of international problems and questions which the governments find it difficult to handle, and through private initiative reaching conclusions which are not of a formal nature, but which unofficially find their way into policies of governments." This arrogant statement on the part of one of the leading foundations clearly indicates that the foundations set themselves above all governments.

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

The Rockefeller Foundation, in its 1946 Report, stated: "The challenge of the future is to make this world one world - a world truly free to engage in common and constructive intellectual efforts that will serve the welfare of mankind everywhere."

The Reece Committee, in commenting on this Report states: "However well-meaning the advocates of complete internationalism may be, they often play into the hands of the Communists. Communists recognize that a breakdown of Nationalism is a prerequisite to the introduction of Communism."

It is significant that the Rockefeller Foundation has been able to put one of its Trustees, Douglas Dillon, in as Secretary of the Treasury of the Kennedy Administration. This particular Kennedy appointment would appear to guarantee that regardless of how political the activities of the foundations may become, they will not lose their tax deductibility. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon can be expected to use the full powers of his office to protect the foundations' tax deductible status. At the same time, Mr. Dillon can be expected to make it extremely difficult for any conservative pro-Constitution foundation or organization to attain a tax deductible status.

INVESTIGATION URGED

THE INDIANAPOLIS NEWS, in urging that the State Department be purged of its so-called "middle echelon" stated: "Recent hearings by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee produced testimony by two former ambassadors saying this 'middle echelon' was directly responsible for the fall of Cuba to Communism, just as it was responsible for the fall of China. THE INDIANAPOLIS NEWS concludes, "It is long past time that the hold of this clique on American foreign policy was broken, and its machinations exposed to public view. THE NEWS urges a full-scale investigation of the Department from top to bottom along the lines of the investigation of The Institute of Pacific Relations. The Internal Security Subcommittee, which so ably handled that inquiry is the logical committee for the job."

NEW PARTY ONLY ANSWER!

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN feels that the documented evidence contained in this article proves conclusively that Rockefeller now controls both the Democratic and the Republican parties. Any hope by die-hard Republicans to recapture the Republican party from Nelson Rockefeller is not only naive, but downright dangerous. Such time-wasting tactics merely allow the internationalist clique, financed by the giant foundations, to solidify their hold on the United States Government.

Conservatives in the Republican Party cannot hope to influence Mr. Rockefeller to a more Conservative position. No person or group can make Mr. Rockefeller change his Liberal, Internationalist views. It should be remembered that it is Mr. Rockefeller and his foundations which are now FORMULATING PUBLIC OPINION in this country through the vast propaganda machines at his command. For the above reasons THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN reiterates its uncompromising position: Only through a new political party, dedicated to Conservative Constitutional principles can the two-party system be restored to the United States!

SOURCES OF INFORMATION:

Hearings and Report on The Institute of Pacific Relations, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, 1951-52.

Hearings and Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress

WHO'S WHO, 1950-51, 1960-61.

Is An Urban Renewal Plan Threatening Your Home ?

Do not be mislead by the terms "slum clearance" and "renewing blighted areas." The URBAN RENEWAL program is merely a Socialist scheme to confiscate private property and turn it over to favored real estate operators for their own developments.

Urban Renewal programs are now in operation in many communities throughout the nation. However, this federally-financed property-confiscation program can be effectively halted by local citizens IF the property owners are informed as to the real meaning of URBAN RENEWAL.

ORDER TODAY our thoroughly-documented pamphlet entitled: "URBAN RENEWAL - A Socialist Scheme to Confiscate Private Property," and send it to all the property owners in your area, to the members of civic clubs, friends, employees, clients, doctors, dentists, etc. (More than 175,000 copies of this pamphlet have been sold in the past year. This pamphlet has been instrumental in defeating Urban Renewal in a number of local elections.)

Order today copies of TAX FAX No. 12, entitled - "URBAN RENEWAL - A Socialist Scheme to Confiscate Private Property". Send your order, accompanied by check or money order to: THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans 18, Louisiana. Prices: Single Copy 25¢; 25 for $1.00; 50 for $2.00; 100 for $4.00; 250 for $8.00; 500 for $16.00; 1,000 for $30.00. Postage Prepaid.

dear reader

Unless you are a paid subscriber to this newspaper, this free sample copy may be the ONLY ONE you receive.

To Keep Up With News of

NEW PARTY ACTIVITY

mail coupon TODAY

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I wish to subscribe to "The Independent American"

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY AND STATE _____

Please send me the next 12 issues - $3.00 _____

Please send me the next 24 issues - $5.00 _____

Please send me a SPECIAL TRIAL OFFER

JANUARY—'61 4 issues - $1.00 _____

Please Make Checks Payable to

THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN

7314 Zimpel Street New Orleans 18, La.

Appeasers

"Each appeaser hopes that if he feeds the crocodile enough, the crocodile will eat him last."

-- Winston Churchill

OUR OWN BLOOD

"To protect themselves against marauding wolf packs, the Eskimos imbed the handles of razor-sharp knives in the ice and smear the blades with seal blood. Thus attracted, the wolves lick the blades eagerly, cut their tongues, and are overjoyed at the seemingly inexhaustible supply of nourishing blood they can lick off the knives. They keep licking until they drop from the loss of their own blood, and promptly freeze to death.

"Now we are in no position to sneer at the wolves - because we've been falling for the same trick for a long time. Too many of us are ready, willing, and anxious to vote for the candidate who promises to 'empty the federal treasury at our feet,' whereas we should know there is nothing there but the tax money we ouselves put in. What we must understand is that these taxes are our blood, and we cannot be nourished by it."

--Buffalo (Wyo.) BULLETIN

New Party Story - - California

Robert F. Clifton, Chairman of the Voters Independent Party of California, has issued a platform of principles which should be of interest to all independent-thinking, Conservative voters.

The platform consists of the following ten simple planks:

1. Repeal of the 16th Amendment (income tax authorization), for Independence.
2. Outlaw Federal corporate activities, for Freedom.
3. Restore the powers of the People, for Independence.
4. Restore the rights of the States, for Freedom.
5. Restore our National sovereignty, for Independence.
6. Restore the American system of free enterprise.
7. Restore the rights of individuals to own precious metals, and apply the Constitutional limitations of Congrss as the sole authority to issue money and regulate its value.
8. Restore control of foreign trade to Congress, for Independence.
9. Restore firm belief in our American Heritage, for Freedom.
10. Compel an annually balanced budget, for Freedom.

A statement of policy of the Voters Independent Party is also included with their platform, as follows:

The Voters Independent Party deplores the use of such terms as "the common man," "the working man or class", "the laboring man or class", "the peasants", "the man on the street", and the political hypocrisy which transforms the voters into such very important people during an election year. The VIP does not present a platform of political expedience, designed to please certain groups at the expense of others nor does it separate Americans into separate classes of voting citizens. The VIP has been created for all of the Very Important People, the people who pay the freight by their labors, their skills and their intelligence, independence and freedom, patriotic American voters who place the inalienable rights of individuals above the rights they have tendered, with suitable constitutional restrictions, to their elected representatives.

The VOTERS INDEPENDENT PARTY will maintain unqualified allegiance to its avowed principle ----- To preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America ---- and calls upon all patriotic Americans to dedicate themselves in a like manner!

Subscribers to THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN in California who wish to affiliate themselves with The Voters Independent Party are urged to contact Mr. Robert F. Clifton, P. O. Box 107, Woodland Hills, California.

(....From Page 1)

TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS INFILTRATE . . .

grants by these million-dollar foundations to some universities, that the universities have, in fact, become captives of the foundations, dutifully arranging their curricula and teaching staff to reflect the one-world policies of the foundations.

Mr. Wormser points up this fact by stating, "Foundation grants have become so important a source of support that college and university presidents cannot afford to ignore the opinions and wishes of the executives who distribute foundation largesse."

Many of the students in universities today are able to attend college only through tremendous financial sacrifice on the part of parents who pay the present high tuition fees. And yet these students are being brainwashed by the left-wing philosophies now taught by universities as a "pay-off" for foundation funds received. The political views of these brainwashed students today will be reflected in the legislation and public affairs of this nation in future years.

One of the most important intermediaries, or clearing houses, for the use of tax-free foundations funds in the educational field is the National Education Association. The NEA, financed by various educational foundations, has in the past 40 or more years been able to exert decisive influence in the field of teaching and textbooks. As a consequence, Mr. Wormser points out, "the schools in the United States were flooded with books which disparaged the free enterprise system and American traditions."

The Reece Committee report on Tax-Exempt Foundations states, "The story of the BUILDING AMERICA textbooks is as good an example as any of the attempt of radical educators, financed by foundations, to suborn the schools. The General Education Board of Rockefeller provided over $50,000 to assist in the development of this series of textbooks....Mr. Aaron Sargent (an attorney who testified in the Reece Committee hearings) pointed out instance after instance in which the attempt was made to destroy our traditions and to use the schools for political propaganda. Yet these books (the BUILDING AMERICA textbooks) were taken over by the National Education Association and promoted broadly for use in the schools....One cannot read the quotations from these books and the comments from the California legislative committee (which investigated the books and later banned them from California schools) without coming to the conclusion that these books promoted by the National Education Association and financed by the Rockefeller Foundation contained vicious, radical propaganda in substantial degree....The books, along with a great amount of propaganda, lampooned some of our great traditional figures, such as Lincoln and Jefferson, and, in contrast, exhibited Stalin in friendly light....The books contained purposely distorted references favoring Communism and life in Soviet Russia, in preference to the life led by Americans."

According to Mr. Rene Wormser's book, these books "were still in use in some parts of the country at the time of the Reece Committee investigation."

COLLECTIVISTS TEACH STUDENTS ABOUT AMERICAN BUSINESS

In an attempt to disparage the free enterprise system, the BUILDING AMERICA textbooks included a pamphlet entitled THE AMERICAN WAY OF BUSINESS, by Oscar Lange and Abba P. Lerner. The Reece Committee Report stated, "Both have been beneficiaries of Rockefeller fellowships; both have been collectivists for a long time. Oscar P. Lange, a professor at the University of Chicago under Robert Maynard Hutchins, renounced his American citizenship in Warsaw in order to accept appointment as ambassador to the United Nations from Communist-Poland."

The Reese Committee Report then goes on to state, "It would be difficult for the National Education Association or the Rockefeller Foundation to convince the average American citizen that THE AMERICAN WAY OF BUSINESS should be taught to the American school child by Messrs. Lange and Lerner."

Below are typical examples of the collectivist thinking as propounded by the pamphlet entitled THE AMERICAN WAY OF BUSINESS:

"It is necessary to have public ownership of monopolistic key industries...

"It is necessary to have public ownership of basic natural resources, mines, oil fields, timber, coal, etc.....

"It is necessary to have public ownership of banks and credit."

It may be well to point out that although the phrase "public ownership" might have a rather innocuous sound, what "public ownership" actually means is "government ownership."

The Reece Committee then points out that "these texts, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and distributed by the National Education Association, must have influenced the thinking of hundreds of thousands of defenseless young Americans. They may well have contributed to the recent philosophy of reckless public spending and overgrowth of government."

ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA INFILTRATED

Not content with injecting anti-American theories into the public school system of the United States, the foundations have extended their educational activities into many contiguous fields. A specific example is THE ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA. On this subject, Mr. Rene Wormser states in his book dealing with the Reece Committee hearings, "Financed by The Rockefeller Foundation, both Columbia University and Cornell University established courses described as an 'Intensive Study of Contemporary Russian Civilization.' It was chiefly to the staffs of these projects that the editors of THE ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA turned to write its section on Soviet Russia....When the work was completed, Cornell University was so pleased with it that, with the permission of the ENCYCLOPEDIA, it converted the Russian section into a textbook, USSR, which was used at Cornell until 1954. In the meantime, many other colleges and universities had adopted it, including Columbia, Rutgers, Swarthmore, Chicago, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Southern California, Washington, and Yale.

"At least 15 out of 20 contributors were, according to Professor Warren S. Walsh of Syracuse University, 'pro-Soviet in varying degrees....' "

LEFT-SLANTED "CANNED" INDEX CARDS

In 1951 the Carnegie Corporation, using Teachers College of Columbia University as its intermediary, launched a program of "Citizenship Education." The project received aggregate grants far in excess of a million dollars from Carnegie Corporation. This program was directed at teachers for the purpose of furnishing them with, as the foundations called it, "fresh teaching materials." The Reece Committee, however, points out: "The fact is that this project was heavily slanted to the left. This appears chiefly in one of its main accomplishments, a card index file; the cards summarized selections from books, magazines, articles, films, etc., and were arranged topically so that high school teachers might select from their references to teach citizenship. The primary usefulness of the card index system was to enable teachers to get the gist of each reference without having to read it. The material was thoroughly 'canned.' The net result was that no one needs to actually read the references, neither teacher nor student - all that is necessary is to digest what has been 'canned' on the card...The preponderance of 'Liberal' leftist, or internationalistic books and references selected for the card system over those which are Conservative and nationalist, is overwhelming." Many of these index cards listed as reference material books and articles by known Communists.

Space does not permit in this article to give a detailed examination of the various other educational activities in which the foundations indulge. Suffice it to say that so carefully knit has been this web of intellectual control that the foundations are now in a position to dictate the political philosophy being taught at almost all levels of education. And, as stated above, the political slant with which both youth and adult citizens of the United States are now being indoctrinated ranges all the way from "Liberal" to actually "pro-Communist."

INFLUENCE OF FOUNDATIONS ON JUDICIAL DECISIONS

The versatility of the giant tax-free foundations is indicated by their entry into the field of civil liberties. Forerunner in this fairly recent activity on the part of the foundations is, of course, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which commissioned Gunnar Myrdal to make a study resulting in a book called AN AMERICAN DILEMMA. The project involved an expenditure of $250,000 granted by the Carnegie Corporation. It will be recalled that the U. S. Supreme Court in 1954 based the integration decision in great part on the conclusions of this book.

Thus it is seen how the foundations, with their unlimited funds, are even able to exert crucial influence on a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, vitally affecting every citizen of the South.

Who is this Gunnar Myrdal who edited the highly controversial book on which the Supreme Court based its segregation decision? Gunnar Myrdal, expounding on a subject which has to do with the American way of life, is not even an American citizen! Myrdal is a Swede, and an extreme Socialist, to boot. His book, AN AMERICAN DILEMMA, reveals his contempt for the American people, the American system of government, and the United States Constitution. In his book, AN AMERICAN DILEMMA, Gunnar Myrdal states, "...the 150-year-old Constitution is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions." He states, "Modern historical studies of how the Constitution came to be as it is reveal that the Constitutional Convention was nearly a plot against the common people."

Gunnar Myrdal arrogantly refers to what he calls an "anarchistic tendence in America's legal culture", and further states, "If in the course of time Americans are brought to be a law-abiding people..." What this Swedish upstart really means is that he hopes to live to see the day when the once-proud American people will accept the yoke of an all-powerful Federal dictatorship, which would have the power to impose on the American people the tyrannical theories that Myrdal expresses. This is just another example of the dangerous propaganda that the foundations finance.

George Washington stated "Let there be no change by usurpation...." The foundations, through their diffuse infiltration into the judiciary arm of the United States government, are seeking to substitute psychological theories such as those embodied in AN AMERICAN DILEMMA for the iron-clad guarantees of personal freedom contained in the U.S. Constitution.

FOUNDATIONS' INFLUENCE INFILTRATES GOVERNMENT

Not only did the Reece Committee hearings bring out the incontrovertible fact of the interlocking, intermeshing, and interchanging operations of the foundations regarding personnel and finances, but also brought out in the Reece Committee hearings was the fact that these interlocking foundations are now able to exert tremendous influence on GOVERNMENTAL policies.

Kathryn Casey, legal analyst for the Reece Committee, issued a report contained in the Committee hearing which, according to the Committee Report "shows clearly the interlock between the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and some of its associated organizations, such as the Council on Foreign Relations and other foundations, with the State Department. Indeed, these foundations and organizations would not dream of denying this interlock. They proudly note it in reports. They have undertaken vital research projects for the State Department; virtually created minor departments within the Department; supplied advisors and executives from their ranks; fed a constant stream of personnel into the State Department trained by themselves or under programs which they have financed; and have had much to do with the formulation of foreign policy both in principle and detail."

The Reece Committee Report then continues by stating that "the giant tax-free foundations have, to a marked degree, acted as direct agents of the State Department, and they have engaged actively, and with the expenditure of enormous sums, in propagandizing ("education" ? - public opinion) in support of the policies which they have helped to formulate."

The Report on Tax-Exempt Foundations then asks "...whether it is proper for the State Department to permit organizations to take over important parts of its research and policy-making functions when these organizations constantly maintain a biased one-tracked point of view....What we see here is a number of large foundations, primarily the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, using their enormous funds to finance a one-sided approach to foreign policy, and to promote actively among the public by propaganda, and in the government through infiltration."

The accompanying article illustrates how the foundations have managed to put their men into key positions in the Kennedy administration.

If you wish further information concerning foundations, THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN recommends the book FOUNDATIONS: THEIR POWER AND INFLUENCE, by Rene A. Wormser, published by Devin-Adair Company. If this book is not available in your book store, you may obtain same by sending your check or money order for $7.50 to THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN, P. O. Box 4223, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Bumper Stickers Available

Car bumper strips bearing the slogans "BACK TO THE CONSTITUTION," "REPEAL THE INCOME TAX," "SUPPORT FREE ENTERPRISE," "FIGHT COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM," "FREEDOM IS UP TO YOU," and "THINK AMERICAN," can be obtained from THE FIGHTING AMERICAN, Hereford, Texas. These bumper strips are 4 inches wide by 15 inches long, and are available at a cost of 75¢ per set. Send your order today, together with your check or money order to Mr. Homer Owen, Editor, THE FIGHTING AMERICAN, Hereford, Texas.

$750 BILLIONS !

"The 290 billion dollars of current public debt, plus 350 billion dollars of future obligations for past services, plus 98 billion dollars of C.O.D.'s, adds to the almost incredible total of about 750 billion dollars. That is the federal government's mortgage on America's future, beyond the regular annual cost of defense, welfare, and commerce."

--Maurice H. Stans, Director U.S. Bureau of the Budget

Are YOU A Conservative ?

To sincerely defend the United States of America as a sovereign Constitutional Republic, one must have courage, logic, reasoning, old-fashioned good sense, a high sense of moral principle which prevents compromise with evil, and a love of God and country. If you have these attributes -- YOU are a Conservative!

Frightening To Contemplate

"It (the Supreme Court) threatens the very foundations of our Republic . . . it has usurped the legislative powers vested in Congress; tended to favor the Communist and criminal elements of this country; glibly overruled and set aside decisions made and precedents established at a time when the court was composed of justices learned in the law and schooled in the rudiments of American jurisprudence. (It has) ignored and nullified the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which reserves to the States all powers not delegated to the Federal Government. The inevitable consequences of such decisions are frightening to contemplate. Unless these trends can be checked, the usurpation of legislative powers stopped, State Sovereignty will be destroyed, and a centralized government enthroned by judicial fiat and decree."

--Senator John J. McClellan

ATTENTION!

CIVIC CLUBS, NEW PARTIES
PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS - STATES RIGHTERS
POLITICAL CLUBS
CITIZENS COUNCILS
UP TO 100 FREE COPIES
OF THE INDEPENDENT AMERICAN
AVAILABLE TO YOU WRITE US YOUR NEEDS